



SELECTED WORKS
OF
MAO TSE-TUNG

Volume V



WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!



毛泽东

From Marx to Mao



© Digital Reprints
2006

SELECTED WORKS
OF
MAO TSE-TUNG

Volume V

FROM MARX
TO MAO



NOT FOR
COMMERCIAL
DISTRIBUTION

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1967

First Edition 1977

The present volume is the authorized English translation of the first Chinese edition of the fifth volume of the *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, published in April 1977 by the People's Publishing House, Peking.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

PUBLICATION NOTE

The works of our great leader and teacher Chairman Mao Tsetung are immortal monuments of Marxism-Leninism. In accordance with the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Volume V of the *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung* has now been published and the subsequent volumes will come out in succession.

The previously published Volumes I to IV of the *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung* contain important writings from the period of the new-democratic revolution. Volume V and succeeding volumes contain important writings from the period of the socialist revolution and socialist construction.

In the new historical period since the founding of the People's Republic of China, Comrade Mao Tsetung, consistently upholding the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution, inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism as he led our Party and our people in a series of struggles; these were struggles to carry out the socialist revolution and socialist construction, to oppose the revisionist lines of Kao-Jao, Peng Teh-huai, Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Wang-Chang-Chiang-Yao, to fight against imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries and to combat modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist renegade clique as its centre. During this period Comrade Mao Tsetung's greatest contributions to theory were to sum up systematically the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and abroad, analyse the contradictions, classes and class struggle in socialist society by means of the fundamental concept of materialist dialectics, the unity of opposites, and thereby to reveal the law of development of socialist society and create the great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The new ideas, new theses, of Comrade Mao Tsetung concerning the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat have greatly enriched the treasure-house of Marxist-Leninist theory in the realms of philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism. They not only chart the Chinese people's true road for consolidating the

dictatorship of the proletariat, preventing capitalist restoration and building socialism, but are also of great and lasting world significance.

Volume V of the *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung* contains important writings from September 1949 through 1957. It was in these writings that Comrade Mao Tsetung for the first time put forward: the scientific thesis that the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist road and the capitalist road, will still exist for a long time after the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production; the teachings about correctly distinguishing and handling the two types of contradictions in socialist society that are different in nature, those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people; the great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat; and the ideas underlying the general line for building socialism. Later, particularly during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, Comrade Mao Tsetung continued to enrich and develop this body of brilliant thought on the basis of the practical experience of the revolution.

Comrade Mao Tsetung was the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our time. Mao Tsetung Thought is the victorious banner under which our Party, our army and our people will fight in unity and continue the revolution; it is a treasure shared in common by the international proletariat and the revolutionary people of all countries. Comrade Mao Tsetung's thought and teachings will live for ever.

Some of Comrade Mao Tsetung's writings from the period of the socialist revolution and socialist construction contained in the *Selected Works* have been published before; others have not, and they include documents drafted by him, his manuscripts and official records of his speeches. Some necessary technical editing of the records of the speeches was done in the course of compilation.

Committee for Editing and Publishing
the Works of Chairman Mao Tsetung,
Central Committee of the Communist
Party of China

March 1, 1977

FROM MARX CONTENTS TO MAO

THE PERIOD OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION (I)

THE CHINESE PEOPLE HAVE STOOD UP! (<i>September 21, 1949</i>)	15
LONG LIVE THE GREAT UNITY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE! (<i>September 30, 1949</i>)	19
ETERNAL GLORY TO THE HEROES OF THE PEOPLE! (<i>September 30, 1949</i>)	22
ALWAYS KEEP TO THE STYLE OF PLAIN LIVING AND HARD STRUGGLE (<i>October 26, 1949</i>)	23
REQUEST FOR OPINIONS ON THE TACTICS FOR DEALING WITH RICH PEASANTS (<i>March 19, 1950</i>)	24
FIGHT FOR A FUNDAMENTAL TURN FOR THE BETTER IN THE NATION'S FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC SITUATION (<i>June 6, 1950</i>)	26
DON'T HIT OUT IN ALL DIRECTIONS (<i>June 6, 1950</i>)	33
BE A TRUE REVOLUTIONARY (<i>June 23, 1950</i>)	37
YOU ARE MODELS FOR THE WHOLE NATION (<i>September 25, 1950</i>)	41
ORDER TO THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S VOLUNTEERS (<i>October 8, 1950</i>)	43
THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S VOLUNTEERS SHOULD CHERISH EVERY HILL, EVERY RIVER, EVERY TREE AND EVERY BLADE OF GRASS IN KOREA (<i>January 19, 1951</i>)	44
MAIN POINTS OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ENLARGED MEETING OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA (<i>February 18, 1951</i>)	45
I. Twenty-two Months for Preparation	45
II. Propaganda and Education Campaign for Resisting U.S. Aggression and Aiding Korea	45
III. Agrarian Reform	46
IV. Suppression of Counter-Revolutionaries	46
V. Urban Work	47

VI. Party Consolidation and Party Building	47
VII. United Front Work	48
VIII. Rectification Movement	49
THE PARTY'S MASS LINE MUST BE FOLLOWED IN SUPPRESSING COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES (<i>May 1951</i>)	50
STRIKE SURELY, ACCURATELY AND RELENTLESSLY IN SUPPRESS- ING COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES (<i>December 1950 - September 1951</i>)	53
PAY SERIOUS ATTENTION TO THE DISCUSSION OF THE FILM THE LIFE OF WU HSUN (<i>May 20, 1951</i>)	57
GREAT VICTORIES IN THREE MASS MOVEMENTS (<i>October 23, 1951</i>)	59
ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE "THREE EVILS" AND THE "FIVE EVILS" (<i>November, 1951 - March, 1952</i>)	64
TAKE MUTUAL AID AND CO-OPERATION IN AGRICULTURE AS A MAJOR TASK (<i>December 15, 1951</i>)	71
NEW YEAR'S DAY MESSAGE (<i>January 1, 1952</i>)	72
ON THE POLICIES FOR OUR WORK IN TIBET—DIRECTIVE OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA (<i>April 6, 1952</i>)	73
THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE WORKING CLASS AND THE BOURGEOISIE IS THE PRINCIPAL CONTRADICTION IN CHINA (<i>June 6, 1952</i>)	77
LET US UNITE AND CLEARLY DISTINGUISH BETWEEN OURSELVES AND THE ENEMY (<i>August 4, 1952</i>)	78
HAIL THE SIGNAL VICTORY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S VOLUN- TEERS! (<i>October 24, 1952</i>)	82
COMBAT BUREAUCRACY, COMMANDISM AND VIOLATIONS OF THE LAW AND OF DISCIPLINE (<i>January 5, 1953</i>)	84
CRITICIZE HAN CHAUVINISM (<i>March 16, 1953</i>)	87
SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF THE "FIVE EXCESSES" (<i>March 19, 1953</i>)	89
LIU SHAO-CHI AND YANG SHANG-KUN CRITICIZED FOR BREACH OF DISCIPLINE IN ISSUING DOCUMENTS IN THE NAME OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION (<i>May 19, 1953</i>)	92
REFUTE RIGHT DEVIATIONIST VIEWS THAT DEPART FROM THE GENERAL LINE (<i>June 15, 1953</i>)	93
THE YOUTH LEAGUE IN ITS WORK MUST TAKE THE CHARAC- TERISTICS OF YOUTH INTO CONSIDERATION (<i>June 30, 1953</i>)	95
ON STATE CAPITALISM (<i>July 9, 1953</i>)	101

THE PARTY'S GENERAL LINE FOR THE TRANSITION PERIOD (August 1953)	102
COMBAT BOURGEOIS IDEAS IN THE PARTY (August 12, 1953)	103
THE ONLY ROAD FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF CAPITALIST INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE (September 7, 1953)	112
OUR GREAT VICTORY IN THE WAR TO RESIST U.S. AGGRESSION AND AID KOREA AND OUR FUTURE TASKS (September 12, 1953)	115
CRITICISM OF LIANG SHU-MING'S REACTIONARY IDEAS (Sep- tember 16-18, 1953)	121
TWO TALKS ON MUTUAL AID AND CO-OPERATION IN AGRI- CULTURE (October and November 1953)	131
I. The Talk of October 15	131
II. The Talk of November 4	135
ON THE DRAFT CONSTITUTION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA (June 14, 1954)	141
STRIVE TO BUILD A GREAT SOCIALIST COUNTRY (September 15, 1954)	148
LETTER CONCERNING THE STUDY OF <i>THE DREAM OF THE RED CHAMBER</i> (October 16, 1954)	150
THE CHINESE PEOPLE CANNOT BE COWED BY THE ATOM BOMB (January 5, 1954)	152
SPEECHES AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE COM- MUNIST PARTY OF CHINA (March 1955)	154
Opening Speech	154
Concluding Speech	158
1. Evaluation of the Present Conference	158
2. On the First Five-Year Plan	160
3. On the Anti-Party Alliance	161
4. On the Current Situation	167
5. Strive for the Successful Convocation of the Eighth National Congress of the Party	169
IN REFUTATION OF "UNIFORMITY OF PUBLIC OPINION" (May 24, 1955)	172
PREFACE AND EDITOR'S NOTES TO <i>MATERIAL ON THE COUNTER- REVOLUTIONARY HU FENG CLIQUE</i> (May and June 1955)	176
Preface	176
Editorial Notes (Selections)	178
ON THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE (July 31, 1955)	184

RELY ON PARTY AND LEAGUE MEMBERS AND POOR AND LOWER-MIDDLE PEASANTS IN THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE (<i>September 7, 1955</i>)	208
THE DEBATE ON THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE AND THE CURRENT CLASS STRUGGLE (<i>October 1955</i>)	211
I. The Relationship Between Agricultural Co-operation and the Transformation of Capitalist Industry and Commerce	212
II. A Summing-up of the Debate on the Question of Co-operation	216
III. On The Question of Comprehensive Planning and More Effective Leadership	218
IV. On Ideological Struggle	223
V. Other Questions	226
PREFACES TO <i>SOCIALIST UPSURGE IN CHINA'S COUNTRYSIDE</i> (<i>September and December 1955</i>)	235
Preface I	235
Preface II	238
EDITOR'S NOTES FROM <i>SOCIALIST UPSURGE IN CHINA'S COUNTRYSIDE</i> (<i>September and December 1955</i>)	242
REQUEST FOR OPINIONS ON THE SEVENTEEN-ARTICLE DOCUMENT CONCERNING AGRICULTURE (<i>December 21, 1955</i>)	277
SPEED UP THE SOCIALIST TRANSFORMATION OF HANDICRAFTS (<i>March 5, 1956</i>)	281
ON THE TEN MAJOR RELATIONSHIPS (<i>April 25, 1956</i>)	284
I. The Relationship Between Heavy Industry on the One Hand and Light Industry on the Other	285
II. The Relationship Between Industry in the Coastal Regions and Industry in the Interior	286
III. The Relationship Between Economic Construction and Defense Construction	288
IV. The Relationship Between the State, the Units of Production and the Producers	289
V. The Relationship Between the Central and the Local Authorities	292
VI. The Relationship Between the Han Nationality and the Minority Nationalities	295
VII. The Relationship Between Party and Non-Party	296

VIII. The Relationship Between Revolution and Counter-Revolution	298
IX. The Relationship Between Right and Wrong	301
X. The Relationship Between China and Other Countries	303
U.S. IMPERIALISM IS A PAPER TIGER (<i>July 14, 1956</i>)	308
STRENGTHEN PARTY UNITY AND CARRY FORWARD PARTY TRADITIONS (<i>August 30, 1956</i>)	312
SOME EXPERIENCES IN OUR PARTY'S HISTORY (<i>September 25, 1956</i>)	324
IN COMMEMORATION OF DR. SUN YAT-SEN (<i>November 12, 1956</i>)	330
SPEECH AT THE SECOND PLENARY SESSION OF THE EIGHTH CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA (<i>November 12, 1956</i>)	332
TALKS AT A CONFERENCE OF SECRETARIES OF PROVINCIAL, MUNICIPAL AND AUTONOMOUS REGION PARTY COMMITTEES (<i>January 1956</i>)	350
I. The Talk of January 18	350
II. The Talk of January 27	359
ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE (<i>February 27, 1956</i>)	384
I. Two Types of Contradictions Differing in Nature	384
II. The Question of Eliminating Counter-Revolutionaries	396
III. The Question of the Co-operative Transformation of Agriculture	399
IV. The Question of the Industrialists and Businessmen	402
V. The Question of the Intellectuals	404
VI. The Question of the Minority Nationalities	406
VII. Over-all Consideration and Proper Arrangement	407
VIII. On "Let a Hundred Flowers Bloom, Let a Hundred Schools of Thought Contend" and "Long-Term Coexistence and Mutual Supervision"	408
IX. On the Question of Disturbances Created by Small Numbers of People	414
X. Can Bad Things Be Turned into Good Things?	416
XI. On Practising Economy	417
XII. China's Path to Industrialization	419
SPEECH AT THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PROPAGANDA WORK (<i>March 12, 1957</i>)	422

PERSEVERE IN PLAIN LIVING AND HARD STRUGGLE, MAINTAIN CLOSE TIES WITH THE MASSES (<i>March 1957</i>)	436
THINGS ARE BEGINNING TO CHANGE (<i>May 15, 1957</i>)	440
THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY IS THE CORE OF LEADERSHIP OF THE WHOLE CHINESE PEOPLE (<i>May 25, 1957</i>)	447
MUSTER OUR FORCES TO REPULSE THE RIGHTISTS' WILD ATTACKS (<i>June 8, 1957</i>)	448
WEN HUI PAO'S BOURGEOIS ORIENTATION SHOULD BE CRITI- CIZED (<i>July 1, 1957</i>)	451
BEAT BACK THE ATTACKS OF THE BOURGEOIS RIGHTISTS (<i>July 9, 1957</i>)	457
THE SITUATION IN THE SUMMER OF 1957	473
BE ACTIVISTS IN PROMOTING THE REVOLUTION	483
HAVE FIRM FAITH IN THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE (<i>October 13, 1957</i>)	498
A DIALECTICAL APPROACH TO INNER-PARTY UNITY (<i>November 18, 1957</i>)	514
ALL REACTIONARIES ARE PAPER TIGERS (<i>November 18, 1957</i>)	517

**THE PERIOD OF
THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND
SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION (I)**

THE CHINESE PEOPLE HAVE STOOD UP!

September 21, 1949

Fellow Delegates,

The Political Consultative Conference so eagerly awaited by the whole nation is herewith inaugurated.

Our conference is composed of more than six hundred delegates, representing all the democratic parties and people's organizations of China, the People's Liberation Army, the various regions and nationalities of the country and the overseas Chinese. This shows that ours is a conference embodying the great unity of the people of the whole country.

It is because we have defeated the reactionary Kuomintang government backed by U.S. imperialism that this great unity of the whole people has been achieved. In a little more than three years the heroic Chinese People's Liberation Army, an army such as the world has seldom seen, crushed all the offensives launched by the several million troops of the U.S.-supported reactionary Kuomintang government and turned to the counter-offensive and the offensive. At present the field armies of the People's Liberation Army, several million strong, have pushed the war to areas near Taiwan, Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Kweichow, Szechuan and Sinkiang, and the great majority of the Chinese people have won liberation. In a little more than three years the people of the whole country have closed their ranks, rallied to support the People's Liberation Army, fought the enemy and won basic victory. And it is on this foundation that the present People's Political Consultative Conference is convened.

Our conference is called the Political Consultative Conference because some three years ago we held a Political Consultative Conference with Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang.¹ The results of that

¹ Opening address at the First Plenary Session of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

conference were sabotaged by Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and its accomplices; nevertheless the conference left an indelible impression on the people. It showed that nothing in the interest of the people could be accomplished together with Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, the running dog of imperialism, and its accomplices. Even when resolutions were reluctantly adopted, it was of no avail, for as soon as the time was ripe, they tore them up and started a ruthless war against the people. The only gain from that conference was the profound lesson it taught the people that there is absolutely no room for compromise with Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, the running dog of imperialism, and its accomplices — overthrow these enemies or be oppressed and slaughtered by them, either one or the other, there is no other choice. In a little more than three years the Chinese people, led by the Chinese Communist Party, have quickly awakened and organized themselves into a nation-wide united front against imperialism, feudalism, bureaucrat-capitalism and their general representative, the reactionary Kuomintang government, supported the People's War of Liberation, basically defeated the reactionary Kuomintang government, overthrown the rule of imperialism in China and restored the Political Consultative Conference.

The present Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference is convened on an entirely new foundation; it is representative of the people of the whole country and enjoys their trust and support. Therefore, the conference proclaims that it will exercise the functions and powers of a National People's Congress. In accordance with its agenda, the conference will enact the Organic Law of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, the Organic Law of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference; it will elect the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and the Central People's Government Council of the People's Republic of China; it will adopt the national flag and national emblem of the People's Republic of China; and it will decide on the seat of the capital of the People's Republic of China and adopt the chronological system in use in most countries of the world.

Fellow Delegates, we are all convinced that our work will go down in the history of mankind, demonstrating that the Chinese people, comprising one quarter of humanity, have now stood up. The Chinese have always been a great, courageous and industrious nation;

it is only in modern times that they have fallen behind. And that was due entirely to oppression and exploitation by foreign imperialism and domestic reactionary governments. For over a century our forefathers never stopped waging unyielding struggles against domestic and foreign oppressors, including the Revolution of 1911 led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, our great forerunner in the Chinese revolution. Our forefathers enjoined us to carry out their unfulfilled will. And we have acted accordingly. We have closed our ranks and defeated both domestic and foreign oppressors through the People's War of Liberation and the great people's revolution, and now we are proclaiming the founding of the People's Republic of China. From now on our nation will belong to the community of the peace-loving and freedom-loving nations of the world and work courageously and industriously to foster its own civilization and well-being and at the same time to promote world peace and freedom. Ours will no longer be a nation subject to insult and humiliation. We have stood up. Our revolution has won the sympathy and acclaim of the people of all countries. We have friends all over the world.

Our revolutionary work is not completed, the People's War of Liberation and the people's revolutionary movement are still forging ahead and we must keep up our efforts. The imperialists and the domestic reactionaries will certainly not take their defeat lying down; they will fight to the last ditch. After there is peace and order throughout the country, they are sure to engage in sabotage and create disturbances by one means or another and every day and every minute they will try to stage a come-back. This is inevitable and beyond all doubt, and under no circumstances must we relax our vigilance.

Our state system, the people's democratic dictatorship, is a powerful weapon for safeguarding the fruits of victory of the people's revolution and for thwarting the plots of domestic and foreign enemies for restoration, and this weapon we must firmly grasp. Internationally, we must unite with all peace-loving and freedom-loving countries and peoples, and first of all with the Soviet Union and the New Democracies, so that we shall not stand alone in our struggle to safeguard these fruits of victory and to thwart the plots of domestic and foreign enemies for restoration. As long as we persist in the people's democratic dictatorship and unite with our foreign friends, we shall always be victorious.

The people's democratic dictatorship and solidarity with our foreign friends will enable us to accomplish our work of construction

rapidly. We are already confronted with the task of nation-wide economic construction. We have very favourable conditions: a population of 475 million people and a territory of 9,600,000 square kilometres. There are indeed difficulties ahead, and a great many too. But we firmly believe that by heroic struggle the people of the country will surmount them all. The Chinese people have rich experience in overcoming difficulties. If our forefathers, and we also, could weather long years of extreme difficulty and defeat powerful domestic and foreign reactionaries, why can't we now, after victory, build a prosperous and flourishing country? As long as we keep to our style of plain living and hard struggle, as long as we stand united and as long as we persist in the people's democratic dictatorship and unite with our foreign friends, we shall be able to win speedy victory on the economic front.

An upsurge in economic construction is bound to be followed by an upsurge of construction in the cultural sphere. The era in which the Chinese people were regarded as uncivilized is now ended. We shall emerge in the world as a nation with an advanced culture.

Our national defence will be consolidated and no imperialists will ever again be allowed to invade our land. Our people's armed forces must be maintained and developed with the heroic and steeled People's Liberation Army as the foundation. We will have not only a powerful army but also a powerful air force and a powerful navy.

Let the domestic and foreign reactionaries tremble before us! Let them say we are no good at this and no good at that. By our own indomitable efforts we the Chinese people will unswervingly reach our goal.

The heroes of the people who laid down their lives in the People's War of Liberation and the people's revolution shall live for ever in our memory!

Hail the victory of the People's War of Liberation and the people's revolution!

Hail the founding of the People's Republic of China!

Hail the triumph of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference!

NOTES

¹ "Smash Chiang Kai-shek's Offensive by a War of Self-Defence", Note 2, *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. IV.

LONG LIVE THE GREAT UNITY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE!

September 30, 1949

Fellow-Countrymen,

The First Plenary Session of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference has successfully fulfilled its tasks.

This session has been attended by delegates from all the democratic parties and people's organizations of China, the People's Liberation Army, the various regions and nationalities of the country, the overseas Chinese and other patriotic democrats; it represents the will of the people of the whole country and demonstrates their unprecedented great unity.

This great unity of the whole people has been achieved only after long years of heroic struggle, only after the Chinese people and the People's Liberation Army, led by the Communist Party of China, defeated Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary Kuomintang government backed by U.S. imperialism. For over a century, the pioneers of the Chinese people, including such outstanding men as the great revolutionary Dr. Sun Yat-sen who led the Revolution of 1911, have guided the masses in their unceasing struggles to overthrow oppression by the imperialists and reactionary Chinese regimes; this goal has now been finally attained through their dauntless and persistent efforts. We are holding this session at a time when the Chinese people have triumphed over their enemies, changed the face of their country and founded the People's Republic of China. We the 475 million Chinese people have now stood up and the future of our nation is infinitely bright.

The First Plenary Session of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference entrusted Comrade Mao Tsetung with the drafting of this declaration. On the proposal of the delegates the phrase "under the leadership of Chairman Mao Tsetung, the leader of our people" was inserted in the declaration at the time of its adoption.

Under the leadership of Chairman Mao Tsetung, the leader of our people, our session, working with one mind and in accordance with the principle of New Democracy, has enacted the Organic Law of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, the Organic Law of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference; decided on Peking as the capital of the People's Republic of China; adopted a flag with five stars on a field of red as the national flag of the People's Republic of China and the *March of the Volunteers* as the present national anthem;- adopted the Christian era as the chronological system of the People's Republic of China; and elected the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and the Central People's Government Council of the People's Republic of China. Thus begins a new era in the history of China.

Fellow-countrymen, the founding of the People's Republic of China is proclaimed, and the Chinese people now have their own Central Government. In accordance with the Common Programme, the government will exercise the people's democratic dictatorship over the length and breadth of China. It will direct the People's Liberation Army to carry the revolutionary war through to the end, wipe out the remnant enemy troops and liberate the entire territory of the country to fulfil the great task of unifying China. It will lead the people of the whole country in surmounting all difficulties and undertaking large-scale construction in the economic and cultural spheres to eliminate the poverty and ignorance inherited from the old China and improve the material and cultural life of the people step by step. It will protect the interests of the people and stamp out all the conspiracies of counter-revolutionaries. It will strengthen the people's army, navy and air force, consolidate national defence, safeguard our territorial integrity and sovereignty and oppose aggression by any imperialist country. It will unite and ally itself with all peace-loving and freedom-loving countries, nations and peoples, and first of all with the Soviet Union and the New Democracies, and together with them fight against imperialist plots to provoke war and so strive for lasting world peace.

Fellow-countrymen, we should get ourselves better organized. We should organize the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people in political, military, economic, cultural and other organizations and put an end to the disorganized state characterizing the old China, so

that the great collective strength of the masses may be tapped both to support the People's Government and the People's Liberation Army and to build a new China, independent, democratic, peaceful, unified, prosperous and strong.

The heroes of the people who laid down their lives in the People's War of Liberation and the people's revolution shall live for ever in our memory!

Long live the great unity of the Chinese people!

Long live the People's Republic of China!

Long live the Central People's Government!

ETERNAL GLORY TO THE HEROES OF THE PEOPLE!

September 30, 1949

Eternal glory to the heroes of the people who laid down their lives in the people's war of liberation and the people's revolution in the past three years!

Eternal glory to the heroes of the people who laid down their lives in the people's war of liberation and the people's revolution in the past thirty years!

Eternal glory to the heroes of the people who from 1840 laid down their lives in the many struggles against domestic and foreign enemies and for national independence and the freedom and well-being of the people!

Epitaph on the Monument to the Heroes of the People drafted by Comrade Mao Tsetung.

ALWAYS KEEP TO THE STYLE OF PLAIN LIVING AND HARD STRUGGLE

October 26, 1949

Comrades in Yen-an and Fellow-Countrymen in the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region:

I am very happy and grateful to receive your message of greetings. From 1936 to 1948 Yen-an and the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region were the seat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the general rear area of the Chinese people's struggle for liberation. The people of Yen-an and the Border Region have made great contributions to the whole nation. I wish you continued unity, speedy recovery from the wounds of war and progress in your economic and cultural construction. And I hope that the revolutionary personnel of the whole country will always keep to the style of plain living and hard struggle maintained for more than a decade by the working personnel in Yen-an and the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region.

Mao Tsetung

October 26, 1949

REQUEST FOR OPINIONS ON THE TACTICS FOR DEALING WITH RICH PEASANTS

March 12, 1950

At your current meeting of leading provincial comrades please gather opinions on the tactics for dealing with the rich peasants and telegraph these opinions to us. The tactics in question are to leave untouched not only the capitalist rich peasants but also the semi-feudal ones in the agrarian reform scheduled for this winter in southern provinces and some regions in the Northwest and to defer the solution of the problem of the semi-feudal rich peasants for several years. Please consider whether this way is not more advantageous. The reasons for taking this course are: First, the agrarian reform is unprecedented in scale and ultra-Left deviations are likely to occur. If we touch only the landlords and not the rich peasants, we can more effectively isolate the landlords, protect the middle peasants and guard against indiscriminate beating and killing, which would be very hard to prevent otherwise. Second, the agrarian reform in the north was carried out in wartime, with the atmosphere of war prevailing over that of agrarian reform; but now, with the fighting practically over, the agrarian reform stands out in sharp relief, and the shock to society will be particularly great and the landlords' outcries particularly shrill. If we leave the semi-feudal rich peasants untouched for the time being and deal with them a few years later, we will stand on stronger ground, that is to say, politically we will have more initiative. Third, we have formed a united front with the national bourgeoisie politically, economically and organizationally; and since the national bourgeoisie is closely tied up with the land problem, it seems better not to touch the semi-feudal rich peasants

Circular to the Central-South Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and concurrently to the East China Bureau, the South China Sub-Bureau, the Southwest Bureau and the Northwest Bureau.

for the time being in order to set the minds of the national bourgeoisie at rest.

At the meeting of the Political Bureau last November, I raised the question of not touching the rich peasants for the time being, but neither a detailed analysis nor a decision was made then. Now is the time to make a decision. Following that, the Land Law and other documents related to agrarian reform will have to be revised and promulgated for the agrarian reform cadres in the recently liberated provinces to study, so that we can facilitate the agrarian reform which is due to begin after the autumn harvest. Otherwise, we would be letting the right moment slip by and lose the initiative. Therefore, it is most important for the comrades not only of the Central-South Bureau but also of the East China Bureau, the South China Sub-Bureau, the Southwest Bureau and the Northwest Bureau to discuss this question, forward this telegram to the provincial and municipal committees under them for discussion, collect opinions, pro and con, and promptly telegraph them to the Central Committee for our consideration in making the decision.

FIGHT FOR A FUNDAMENTAL TURN FOR THE BETTER IN THE NATION'S FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC SITUATION

June 6, 1950

The present international situation is favourable to us. The world front of peace and democracy headed by the Soviet Union is stronger than it was last year. The people's movement for peace and against war has made headway in all countries. The national liberation movements to throw off the yoke of imperialism have greatly expanded, and the emerging mass movements of the Japanese and the German people against U.S. occupation and the growing people's liberation struggles of the oppressed nations in the East are especially noteworthy. At the same time, contradictions have developed between the imperialist countries, primarily between the United States and Britain. Quarrels among the different groups of the U.S. bourgeoisie and of the British bourgeoisie have also increased. In contrast, there is strong unity between the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies and among the latter. The new treaty between China and the Soviet Union,¹ which is of great and historic significance, has strengthened the friendly relations between the two countries; it enables us to carry on our national construction more freely and more speedily and at the same time promotes the mighty struggle of the people of the world for peace and democracy and against war and oppression. The threat of war from the imperialist camp still exists, and so does the possibility of a third world war. However, the forces fighting to check the danger of war and prevent the outbreak of a third world war are growing rapidly, and the level of political consciousness of most of the world's people is rising. A new world war can be averted,

¹ Written report to the Third Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

provided the Communist Parties of the world continue to unite all possible forces for peace and democracy and help their further development. The war rumours spread by the Kuomintang reactionaries are designed to deceive the people, they are groundless.

The present situation in our country is as follows. The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and local people's governments at all levels have been set up. The Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and a number of capitalist countries have successively established diplomatic relations with our country. Basically the war has ended on the mainland, and only Taiwan and Tibet remain to be liberated, but this task still involves serious struggle. In certain areas on the mainland the Kuomintang reactionaries have resorted to bandit guerrilla warfare and incited some backward elements against the People's Government. They have organized many secret agents and spies to oppose our government and spread rumours among the people in an attempt to undermine the prestige of the Communist Party and the People's Government and to disrupt the unity and co-operation of the various nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties and people's organizations. These secret agents and spies are also engaged in sabotaging the people's economic undertakings, assassinating the personnel of the Party and government organizations and collecting intelligence for the imperialists and the Kuomintang reactionaries. All these counter-revolutionary activities are directed from behind the scenes by imperialism, and particularly by U.S. imperialism. All these bandits, secret agents and spies are imperialist lackeys. In the thirteen and a half months since the operations mounted to cross the Yangtse, which began on April 21, 1949 after the decisive victories in the three great campaigns of Liaohsi-Shenyang, Huai-Hai and Peiping-Tientsin in the winter of 1948, the People's Liberation Army has completed the occupation of all Chinese territory except Tibet and Taiwan and a number of other islands and wiped out 1,830,000 troops of the reactionary Kuomintang and 980,000 of its bandit guerrilla forces; during this time the people's public security organs have uncovered large numbers of reactionary secret service groups and agents. In the new liberated areas, the present task of the People's Liberation Army is to continue to wipe out the remnant bandits and that of the people's public security organs is to continue to strike at the enemy's secret service groups. The great majority of the people throughout the country warmly support the Communist Party, the People's Government and the

People's Liberation Army. In recent months, the People's Government has exercised unified control and unified leadership over financial and economic work on a national scale and has been successful in balancing budgetary revenues and expenditures, checking inflation and stabilizing prices. The whole people have supported the government by delivering grain, paying taxes and buying state bonds.² Last year our country was hit by natural calamities over wide areas; about 120 million *mou* of farmland and 40 million people were affected by flood or drought to a greater or lesser degree. The People's Government has organized extensive relief for the victims and in many places has initiated large-scale water conservancy work. This year's crops are better than last year's and in general the summer harvest looks good. If the autumn harvest is also good, still better prospects for next year may be envisaged. Long years of imperialist and reactionary Kuo-mintang rule left our economy in a chaotic state and caused widespread unemployment. Since our victory in the revolution, there have been reorganizations of varying degrees in the whole of the old economic structure and the number of unemployed has further increased. This is a serious matter, and the People's Government has begun to adopt measures to give relief to the unemployed and find jobs for them so as to solve the problem step by step. It has done extensive work in the spheres of culture and education, and large numbers of intellectuals and students have undertaken either studies of the new knowledge or revolutionary work. It has already done something towards properly readjusting industry and commerce and improving the relations between the state sector and the private sector of the economy and between labour and capital, and it is devoting great efforts towards these ends.

China is a vast country and conditions are very complex; moreover the revolution triumphed first in certain areas and only later throughout the country. Accordingly, in the old liberated areas (with a population of approximately 160 million), agrarian reform has been completed, public order has been established, the work of economic construction has started on the right track, the life of most of the working people has improved, and the problem of unemployed workers and intellectuals has been solved (as in the Northeast) or is nearing solution (as in North China and Shantung Province). In particular, planned economic construction has begun in the Northeast. On the other hand, in the new liberated areas (with a population of approximately 310 million), since liberation occurred only a few months ago,

or half a year or one year ago, the more than 400,000 bandits scattered in remote regions have yet to be wiped out, the land problem has not been solved, industry and commerce have not been properly readjusted, unemployment has remained serious, and public order has not been established. In a word, the conditions for carrying out planned economic construction are still lacking. That is why I said some time ago that we had achieved a number of successes on the economic front, for example, budgetary revenues and expenditures were nearly balanced, inflation was being checked and prices were tending towards stability — all this indicated that the financial and economic situation was beginning to take a turn for the better, but not yet a fundamental turn for the better. Three conditions are required for the fundamental turn for the better in the financial and economic situation, namely, (1) completion of agrarian reform; (2) proper readjustment of existing industry and commerce; and (3) large-scale retrenchment in government expenditures. The fulfilment of these three conditions will take some time, say three years or a little longer. The whole Party and nation must strive to bring about these conditions. I believe, and so do you all, that we can surely do this in about three years. By that time, we shall be able to witness a fundamental turn for the better in the entire financial and economic situation of our country.

To this end, the whole Party and nation must unite and carry out the following tasks:

(1) The work of agrarian reform should proceed step by step and in a systematic way.³ As the war has basically ended on the mainland and the situation is entirely different from that in the period from 1946 to 1948 (when the People's Liberation Army was locked in a life-and-death struggle with the Kuomintang reactionaries and the issue had not yet been decided), it is now possible for the state to extend loans to the poor peasants to help them out of their difficulties and thus make up for the drawback that they are to receive less land. Accordingly, there should be a change in our policy towards the rich peasants, a change from the policy of requisitioning their surplus land and property to one of maintaining the rich peasant economy in order to facilitate the early rehabilitation of rural production and the better to isolate the landlords and protect the middle peasants and lessors of small plots.

(2) Unified control and unified leadership in our financial and economic work should be consolidated, and so too should the balancing of budgetary revenues and expenditures and the stabilization of prices.

In accordance with this principle, taxes should be readjusted and the people's burden appropriately lightened. In line with the principle of making over-all plans and taking all factors into consideration, drifting and anarchy in our economic work should be gradually eliminated. Existing industry and commerce should be properly readjusted, and relations between the state sector and the private sector and between labour and capital should be effectively and suitably improved; thus under the leadership of the socialist state sector all sectors of the economy will function satisfactorily with a due division of labour to promote the rehabilitation and development of the whole economy. The view held by certain people that it is possible to eliminate capitalism and realize socialism at an early date is wrong, it does not tally with our national conditions.

(3) While preserving its main forces, the People's Liberation Army should be partially demobilized in 1950, provided that the forces must be adequate to liberate Taiwan and Tibet, consolidate national defence and suppress counter-revolutionaries. This demobilization must be carried out carefully so as to enable the demobilized soldiers to return home and settle down to productive work. Readjustment is also necessary in administrative organizations, and here too the excess personnel should be dealt with appropriately so that they have the opportunity either to take up work or to study.

(4) Reform of the old school education and of the old cultural institutions in our society should be conducted carefully step by step, and all patriotic intellectuals should be won over to the service of the people. On this question, procrastination or reluctance to introduce reforms is wrong, and so is rashness or any attempt to push them through arbitrarily.

(5) Relief for unemployed workers and intellectuals must be carried out in earnest, and they must be helped to get work in a planned way. Serious efforts to provide relief for people stricken by natural calamities must continue.

(6) We must earnestly unite with the democratic personages in all circles, help them solve the problem of work and study, and overcome any tendency towards either closed-doorism or excessive accommodation in united front work. We must endeavour to make a success of the conferences of people from all circles⁴ so that people from every walk of life can unite in a common effort. All matters of importance to the people's governments should be submitted to these conferences for discussion and decision. Representatives at these conferences must have

the right to express their views fully; any attempt to hinder such expression is wrong.

(7) Bandits, secret agents, local tyrants and other counter-revolutionaries, all of whom are menaces to the people, must be resolutely rooted out. On this question it is necessary to follow a policy of combining suppression with leniency without stressing one to the neglect of the other, that is, a policy of certain punishment for the main culprits, no punishment for those accomplices who act under duress and rewards for those who render positive services. The whole Party and nation must heighten their vigilance against the conspiratorial activities of counter-revolutionaries.

(8) The Central Committee's directives on consolidating and expanding the Party organization, on strengthening the ties between the Party and the masses, on conducting criticism and self-criticism and on launching a rectification movement throughout the Party should all be strictly carried out. Since the membership of our Party has grown to 4,500,000, we must henceforth follow a prudent policy in expanding the Party organization, be strict in preventing political speculators from gaining Party membership and take proper measures to clear out those already in. We must pay attention to admitting politically conscious workers into the Party in a planned way in order to increase the proportion of workers in the Party organizations. In the old liberated areas, in general Party recruiting in the villages should stop. In the new liberated areas, in general the Party organizations in the villages should not expand until agrarian reform is completed in order to prevent political speculators from worming their way into the Party. During the summer, autumn and winter of 1950, the whole Party must carry out a large-scale rectification movement in close co-ordination with its other tasks, not in isolation from them. Such methods as reading selected documents, summing up work, analysing the situation and making criticism and self-criticism should be used to raise the ideological and political level of cadres and rank-and-file Party members, correct mistakes in work, overcome the conceit and complacency of the self-styled distinguished veterans, eliminate bureaucracy and commandism and improve the relations between the Party and the people.

NOTES

¹ This refers to the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance signed on February 14, 1950.

² This refers to the People's Victory Parity Bonds floated by the Central People's Government in 1950.

³ Beginning from the winter of 1950, the new liberated areas, one after another, unfolded a large-scale agrarian reform movement. By the winter of 1952 agrarian reform was basically completed, except in some minority nationality areas. In the old and new liberated areas throughout the country, about 300 million landless or land-deficient peasants received some 700 million *mou* of land.

⁴ Before the election and convocation of the local people's congresses at all levels, conferences of people from all circles were convened, in accordance with the stipulations of the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference of 1949, to exercise the functions and powers of the people's congresses step by step.

DON'T HIT OUT IN ALL DIRECTIONS

June 6, 1950

Since the Second Plenary Session of the Party's Seventh Central Committee, nation-wide victory has been won in the new-democratic revolution led by our Party, and the People's Republic of China has been founded. This is a great victory, a great victory without parallel in the history of China, a great victory of world significance following the October Revolution. Comrade Stalin and many other foreign comrades all consider the victory of the Chinese revolution an extremely great one. And yet many of our comrades don't realize this because they have become so inured to the struggle. We should widely publicize the tremendous significance of the victory of the Chinese revolution inside the Party and among the masses.

In the midst of this great victory we are confronted with very complex struggles and many difficulties.

We have completed agrarian reform in the northern parts of the country with a population of 160 million, and this must be affirmed as an immense achievement. We won the War of Liberation by relying mainly on these 160 million people. It was the victory of the agrarian reform that made possible our victory in overthrowing Chiang Kai-shek. In the autumn we shall start agrarian reform in vast areas with a population of some 310 million in order to topple the entire landlord class. In the agrarian reform our enemies are as numerous as they are powerful. Against us are arrayed, first, the imperialists, second, the reactionaries in Taiwan and Tibet, third, the remnant Kuomintang forces, the secret agents and the bandits, fourth, the landlord class and, fifth, the reactionary forces in the missionary schools established

Part of a speech at the Third Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. It throws light on the written report "Fight for a Fundamental Turn for the Better in the Nation's Financial and Economic Situation" and on its strategic and tactical ideas

in China by the imperialists and in religious circles and those in the cultural and educational institutions taken over from the Kuomintang. These are our enemies. We have to fight them one and all and accomplish the agrarian reform in an area much larger than before. This is a very acute struggle, unprecedented in history.

In the meantime our victory in the revolution has led to the reorganization of our social economy. While necessary, this reorganization puts heavy burdens on us for the time being. Many people are dissatisfied with us because of this reorganization and because of a certain disruption of industry and commerce wrought by the war. At present our relations with the national bourgeoisie are very strained; they are on tenterhooks and are very disgruntled. Unemployed intellectuals and workers are dissatisfied with us and so are a number of small handicraftsmen. The peasants in most rural areas are complaining too because agrarian reform has not yet been carried out there and besides they have to deliver grain to the state.

What is our general policy at present? It is to eliminate the remnant Kuomintang forces, the secret agents and the bandits, overthrow the landlord class, liberate Taiwan and Tibet and fight imperialism to the end. In order to isolate and attack our immediate enemies, we must convert those among the people who are dissatisfied with us into our supporters. Although this task is fraught with difficulties at present, we must overcome them by every possible means.

We should make proper readjustments in industry and commerce so that factories can resume operation and the problem of unemployment can be solved, and we should provide 2,000 million catties of grain for the jobless workers and gain their support. When we reduce rent and interest, suppress the bandits and local tyrants and carry out agrarian reform, the masses of the peasantry will support us. We should also help the small handicraftsmen find ways to earn a living. We should introduce suitable readjustments in industry and commerce and in taxation to improve our relations with the national bourgeoisie rather than aggravate these relations. We should run training courses of various kinds, military and political colleges and revolutionary institutes for the intellectuals and educate and remould them while availing ourselves of their services. We should have them study the history of social development, historical materialism and other subjects. We can induce even those who are idealists not to oppose us. Let them say that man was created by God, we say man evolved from the ape.

Some intellectuals are advanced in age, they are over seventy, and we should provide for them so long as they support the Party and the People's Government.

The whole Party should try earnestly and painstakingly to make a success of its united front work. We should rally the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class and on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance. The national bourgeoisie will eventually cease to exist, but at this stage we should rally them around us and not push them away. We should struggle against them on the one hand and unite with them on the other. We should make this clear to the cadres and show by facts that it is right and necessary to unite with the national bourgeoisie, the democratic parties, democratic personages and intellectuals. Many of them were our enemies before, but now that they have broken with the enemy camp and come over to our side, we should unite with all these people, who can be more or less united with. It is in the interest of the working people to unite with them. We need to adopt these tactics now.

It is of vital importance to unite with the minority nationalities. There are about thirty million of them in the whole country. Social reforms in their areas are a matter of great importance and must be handled cautiously. On no account must we be impetuous, for impatience will lead to trouble. No reform is to be instituted unless the conditions are ripe. Neither should any major reform be introduced where only one of the conditions is ripe while the others are not. Of course, this is not to say that no reform at all is to be carried out. As stipulated by the Common Programme, customs and folk-ways in the minority nationality areas may be reformed. But the minority nationalities themselves should do the reforming. Without popular support, without the people's armed forces and without the minority nationalities' own cadres, no reform of a mass character should be attempted. We must help them train their own cadres and we must unite with the masses of the minority nationalities.

In short, we must not hit out in all directions. It is undesirable to hit out in all directions and cause nation-wide tension. We must definitely not make too many enemies, we must make concessions and relax the tension a little in some quarters and concentrate our attack in one direction. We must do our work well so that all the workers, peasants and small handicraftsmen will support us and the overwhelming majority of the national bourgeoisie and intellectuals will not

oppose us. In this way, the remnant Kuomintang forces, the secret agents and the bandits will be isolated, as will the landlord class and the reactionaries in Taiwan and Tibet, and the imperialists will find themselves isolated before the people of our country. This is our policy, our strategy and tactics, and it is the line of the Third Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Party.

BE A TRUE REVOLUTIONARY

June 23, 1950

The present session has summed up our experience in the past period and laid down various guiding principles.

We have done this work jointly at this gathering of representatives of all the nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties, people's organizations and democratic personages from every walk of life. Not only have the members of the National Committee of the People's Political Consultative Conference taken part in the discussions, many cadres of the Central People's Government and of the people's governments (or military and administrative commissions) of the greater administrative areas,¹ provinces and municipalities as well as representatives from the consultative committees of the provincial and municipal conferences of people from all circles² and many specially invited patriotic personages have also sat in and joined the discussions. Thus we have been able to draw together opinions from all quarters, review our past work and set forth guiding principles for the future. I hope that we will continue to use this method and that the people's governments (or military and administrative commissions) of the greater administrative areas, provinces and municipalities will adopt it too. So far our committee sessions have been advisory in nature. But in practice the Central People's Government will as a matter of course adopt and put into effect the decisions made at our sessions, as it should.

We have unanimously approved the report on the work of the National Committee and the various reports on the work of the Central People's Government. These are the reports on agrarian reform, on political, military, economic and financial work, on taxation, culture and education, and on the work of the judiciary. All of them are good. In these reports the experience of our work in the past has been

Closing address at the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

properly summed up and the guiding principles for our work in the future have been laid down. There were many items on the agenda of our session, because work has started or expanded in every held since the founding of our new state. Throughout the country the people are vigorously unfolding a great and genuine people's revolutionary struggle on all fronts, a struggle that is as great as it is unprecedented on the military, economic, ideological and agrarian reform fronts, and the work in every field awaits summing up and needs guiding principles. That is why we had so many items on the agenda. We shall hold two sessions yearly as required by law, one with a full and the other with a less full agenda. This is what we are called on to do, for China is a large country with a population actually exceeding 475 million and, what is more, it finds itself in a historic period of people's revolution. And this is what we have been doing, and I think we have done right.

Our present session had many subjects for discussion, the central one being the question of transforming the old land system. We have endorsed the Draft Agrarian Reform Law³ proposed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to which we have made a number of useful amendments and supplements. This is fine. I am glad and wish to congratulate the hundreds of millions of new China's rural population on winning the opportunity for emancipation and the nation on winning the basic condition for industrialization. The peasants form the bulk of China's population. It was with their help that victory was won in the revolution, and it is again their help that will make the industrialization of the country possible. Therefore, the working class should actively help the peasants carry out the agrarian reform; the urban petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie should also give their support, and still more so should all the democratic parties and people's organizations. War and agrarian reform are two tests everyone and every political party in China must go through in the historical period of New Democracy. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people is a revolutionary. Whoever sides with imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism is a counter-revolutionary. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in word only but not in deed is a revolutionary in word. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in deed as well as in word is a true revolutionary. The test of war is basically over, and we have all come through well, to the satisfaction of the people of the whole country. Now it is the test of agrarian reform that we have to pass, and I hope we shall acquit ourselves just as well as we did in the test of war. Let us give this matter more thought, have more

consultation, straighten out our thinking, march in step and form a great anti-feudal united front, and then we shall be able to lead the people and help them pass this test successfully. When the tests of war and agrarian reform are passed, the remaining test will be easy to pass, that is, the test of socialism, of country-wide socialist transformation. As for those who have made contributions in the revolutionary war and in the revolutionary transformation of the land system and who continue to do so in the coming years of economic and cultural construction, the people will not forget them when the time comes for nationalizing private industry and socializing agriculture (which is still quite far off), and they will have a bright future. This is how our country steadily advances; it has passed through the war and is undergoing new-democratic reforms, and in the future it will enter the new era of socialism unhurriedly and with proper arrangements when our economy and culture are flourishing, when conditions are ripe and when the transition has been fully considered and endorsed by the whole nation. I think it is necessary to make this point clear so that people will have confidence and stop worrying: "Don't know when I'll no longer be wanted and be given the chance to serve the people even if I wish to." No, that won't happen. The people and their government have no reason to reject anyone or deny him the opportunity of making a living and rendering service to the country, provided he is really willing to serve the people and provided he really helped and did a good turn when the people were faced with difficulties and keeps on doing good without giving up halfway.

With this great aim in mind, in the international sphere we must firmly unite with the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the forces of peace and democracy everywhere, and there should not be the slightest hesitation or wavering on this question. At home, we must unite all the nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties, people's organizations and patriotic democrats and consolidate the great, prestigious revolutionary united front already in existence. Whoever contributes to the consolidation of this revolutionary united front is doing right, and we welcome him; whoever harms this consolidation is doing wrong, and we oppose him. To consolidate the revolutionary united front, we must use the method of criticism and self-criticism. The main criterion in the application of this method is our present fundamental law — the Common Programme. We have carried out criticism and self-criticism at this session, basing ourselves on the Common Programme. This is an excellent method, which impels everyone

of us to uphold truth and rectify error, and it is the only correct method for all revolutionary people to educate and remould themselves in a people's state. The people's democratic dictatorship uses two methods. Towards the enemy, it uses the method of dictatorship, that is, for as long a period of time as is necessary it does not permit them to take part in political activity and compels them to obey the law of the People's Government, to engage in labour and, through such labour, be transformed into new men. Towards the people, on the contrary, it uses the method of democracy and not of compulsion, that is, it must necessarily let them take part in political activity and does not compel them to do this or that but uses the method of democracy to educate and persuade. Such education is self-education for the people, and its basic method is criticism and self-criticism. I hope that this method will be used by all the nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties, people's organizations and patriotic democrats in the country.

NOTES

¹ At that time, the country was divided into six greater administrative areas, namely, the Northeast, North China, East China, the Central South, the Southwest and the Northwest, with a bureau in each representing the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. Each of the five areas except North China had its administrative organ. That of the Northeast was called the people's government, while in the other four it was known as the military and administrative commission. In November 1952 these were all renamed administrative councils, and one such council was also established in North China. In 1954 all the administrative councils were abolished.

² The consultative committees of conferences of people from all circles at the provincial and municipal level were elected by conferences of people from all circles at the same level. When the latter were not in session, the former were charged with the function of assisting the people's governments in carrying out the conferences' resolutions.

³ This refers to the "Draft Agrarian Reform Law of the People's Republic of China". The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party presented the draft to the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference on June 14, 1950 for discussion. After it had been discussed and endorsed by the session, the Central People's Government Council approved the draft. On June 30 of the same year, Mao Tsetung, Chairman of the Central People's Government, promulgated the "Agrarian Reform Law of the People's Republic of China".

YOU ARE MODELS FOR THE WHOLE NATION

September 25, 1950

Comrade Delegates to the National Conferences of Combat Heroes and of Model Workers in Industry, Agriculture and the Army:

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China sends your conferences warm greetings and wishes to thank and salute you for the work you have done.

You have overcome a host of difficulties and hardships and demonstrated immense courage, wisdom and enthusiasm in the struggle to wipe out the enemy and in the struggle to restore and increase industrial and agricultural production. You are models for the whole Chinese nation, activists propelling the people's cause forward to triumph in all spheres of endeavour, a firm pillar of support to the People's Government and a bridge linking the People's Government with the masses.

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party calls on the whole Party and nation to learn from you and at the same time calls on you, dear comrade delegates, and on all the combat heroes and model workers of the country, to keep on learning through struggle and from the masses. Only by guarding against conceit and complacency and continuing to learn tirelessly can you go on making outstanding contributions to the great People's Republic of China and thus live up to your names.

China must build a powerful national defence force and a powerful economy — two tasks of major importance. Fulfilment of these tasks depends on you comrades forging close ties of unity and making concerted efforts together with all the commanders and fighters of the

Message of greetings delivered on behalf of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to the National Conferences of Combat Heroes and of Model Workers in Industry, Agriculture and the Army.

People's Liberation Army and all the workers, peasants and other sections of the people. As the first anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China is approaching, your meeting here is of signal importance. We wish you success in your conferences and great victories in your work in the days to come.

ORDER TO THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S VOLUNTEERS

October 8, 1950

To leading comrades of the Chinese People's Volunteers at all levels:

1. In order to support the Korean people's war of liberation and to resist the attacks of U.S. imperialism and its running dogs, thereby safeguarding the interests of the people of Korea, China and all the other countries in the East, I herewith order the Chinese People's Volunteers to march speedily to Korea and join the Korean comrades in fighting the aggressors and winning a glorious victory.

2. While in Korea, the Chinese People's Volunteers must show fraternal feelings and respect for the people, the People's Army, the Democratic Government, the Workers' Party and the other democratic parties of Korea as well as for Comrade Kim Il Sung, the leader of the Korean people, and strictly observe military and political discipline. This is a most important political basis for ensuring the fulfilment of your military task.

3. You must fully anticipate various possible and inevitable difficulties and be prepared to overcome them with great enthusiasm, courage, care and stamina. At present, the international and domestic situation as a whole is favourable to us, not to the aggressors. So long as you comrades are firm and brave and are good at uniting with the people there and at fighting the aggressors, final victory will be ours.

Mao Tsetung

Chairman of the Chinese People's
Revolutionary Military Commission

October 8, 1950, Peking

Excerpts from an order issued by Comrade Mao Tsetung to the Chinese People's Volunteers.

THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S VOLUNTEERS
SHOULD CHERISH EVERY HILL, EVERY RIVER,
EVERY TREE AND EVERY BLADE OF GRASS
IN KOREA

January 19, 1951

The Chinese and Korean comrades should unite as closely as brothers, go through thick and thin together, stick together in life and death and fight to the end to defeat their common enemy. The Chinese comrades must consider Korea's cause as their own and the commanders and fighters must be instructed to cherish every hill, every river, every tree and every blade of grass in Korea and take not a single needle or a single thread from the Korean people, just the way we feel about our own country and treat our own people. This is the political basis for winning victory. So long as we act this way, final victory will be assured.

Directive to the Chinese People's Volunteers.

MAIN POINTS OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ENLARGED MEETING OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

February 18, 1951

The Political Bureau convened a meeting in mid-February at which responsible comrades from the bureaus of the Central Committee were present and various important questions were discussed. We herewith notify you of the main points of the resolution.

I. TWENTY-TWO MONTHS FOR PREPARATION

The idea of “three years for preparation and ten years for planned economic construction” must be made clear to all cadres from the provincial and municipal level upwards. Counting from now, we have twenty-two months left for making preparations and so we must step up our work in all fields.

II. PROPAGANDA AND EDUCATION CAMPAIGN FOR RESISTING U.S. AGGRESSION AND AIDING KOREA

Persistent efforts must be made to push this campaign throughout the country, to deepen it where it is already under way and spread it

Inner-Party circular drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

where it is not, so as to make sure that this education reaches everyone in every part of the country.

III. AGRARIAN REFORM

1. During the busy farming season, agrarian reform in every place should stop for a while and experience should be summed up.
2. Strive for a good harvest this year.
3. Rely on the county conferences of peasant representatives and on the training classes.
4. Work hard to prepare the necessary conditions. Whenever and wherever they are not ripe, don't force the agrarian reform through.
5. As soon as agrarian reform is completed, switch over to the two major tasks of production and education.
6. East China's method of returning security money in instalments¹ is approved.
7. Persuade the peasants that it is to our advantage to refrain from using torture, which is illegal.
8. After the agrarian reform establish more districts and townships and reduce the area under the jurisdiction of each district and township.

IV. SUPPRESSION OF COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES

1. As a general rule, before passing a death sentence, refer the case to the masses and consult democratic personages.
2. Exercise strict control, guard against indiscriminate action and avoid mistakes.
3. Pay attention to the "middle layer",² and carefully weed out counter-revolutionaries hiding among the old personnel and among the intellectuals recently drawn into our work.
4. Pay attention to the "inner layer", carefully weed out counter-revolutionaries who have sneaked into the Party, and strengthen to the maximum our work of safeguarding secret information.
5. In addition, give education to the cadres and back them up in their work.

V. URBAN WORK

1. Every bureau and sub-bureau of the Central Committee and every Party committee at the level of province, municipality and administrative region must call two meetings on urban work during the year with the agenda set by the Central Committee and report twice on this subject to the Central Committee.

2. Strengthen the leadership of the Party committees over urban work and carry out the resolution adopted at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee.

3. Educate the cadres so that they are clear in their minds about relying on the working class.

4. In factories, the Party should exercise unified leadership over the work of the Party organization, the management, the trade union and the Youth League, with the fulfilment of production plans as the central task.

5. Strive for a gradual improvement in the workers' living conditions on the basis of increased production.

6. The idea of serving the needs of production and of the workers should permeate the planning of urban construction.

7. The All-China Federation of Trade Unions and the higher levels of each trade union should lay stress on solving the specific problems of the lower levels.

8. Party committees and trade unions should make a point of creating models and promptly spread their experience to other places.

VI. PARTY CONSOLIDATION AND PARTY BUILDING

1. Ours is a Party that is great, glorious and correct; this is the principal aspect which must be affirmed and made clear to cadres at all levels. However, it must also be made clear to them that there are problems which have to be straightened out and that in the new liberated areas a prudent attitude should be adopted towards Party building.

2. The consolidation and building of the Party should proceed under the strict control of the Central Committee and its bureaus, and organizations at lower levels must in no case act as they please.

3. The consolidation of the Party should be accomplished in three years. The steps to be taken are as follows. Devote one year (1951) to extensive education on what is required of a Communist, so that the entire membership will know the standards a Communist should live up to, and to the training of personnel for organizational work. At the same time experiment with typical units to serve as models. Then in the light of the experience gained, proceed with consolidation; in cities, however, this can start in 1951. In Party consolidation, first clear out the "persons in the fourth category".³ Then differentiate between the "persons in the second category" and the "persons in the third category", and persuade those who, after education, are still not up to the standards of Party membership to withdraw from the Party, but make sure that they withdraw of their own free will and that their feelings are not hurt. Don't repeat the practice of "removing rocks"⁴ as in 1948.

4. A policy of prudence must be adopted in building the Party in the cities and the new liberated areas. In the cities Party organizations should be set up primarily among the industrial workers. In the rural areas it is only after the completion of the agrarian reform that Party branches can be set up by admitting those who prove themselves qualified for Party membership as a result of education, and for the first two years the membership of a rural Party branch should in general not exceed ten. In city and countryside alike, education on how to be a Communist should be conducted among activists who are ready to receive it, and after such education those really qualified for Party membership should be admitted.

VII. UNITED FRONT WORK

1. The bureaus and sub-bureaus of the Central Committee and Party committees at the level of province, municipality and administrative region are required to call two meetings in 1951 to discuss united front work and report twice on this subject to the Central Committee.

2. It must be made clear to the cadres why our united front work needs to be strengthened.

3. It is necessary to unite intellectuals, industrialists and businessmen, leading religious figures, the democratic parties and democratic personages on the basis of the struggle against imperialism and feudalism and to carry out education among them.

4. Work conscientiously among the minority nationalities, the two central tasks being to push for regional autonomy and to train cadres from these nationalities.

VIII. RECTIFICATION MOVEMENT

This movement should be carried out once every winter for a short period; the aim is to review our work, sum up experience, enhance achievements and overcome mistakes and shortcomings, and thus educate the cadres.

NOTES

¹ Before liberation the peasants who rented land from the landlords had to pay a considerable sum of security money in advance for their tenancy. During the agrarian reform the peasants demanded reimbursement of this money by the landlords, and this was known as the return of security money. Those landlords who were also running industrial and commercial enterprises or who were unable to repay the sum all at once were allowed to return it in instalments.

² In the work of suppressing counter-revolutionaries, there are three layers to be swept clean, the outer, middle and inner layers. To sweep clean the "outer layer" refers to uncovering counter-revolutionaries lying low in society at large; to sweep clean the "middle layer" refers to uncovering counter-revolutionaries lying low in our army units and government organizations; and to sweep clean the "inner layer" refers to uncovering counter-revolutionaries lying low in our Party.

³ During the 1951 Party consolidation, Party members were classified into four categories: first, those who were qualified members, second, those who were not fully qualified or had fairly serious shortcomings and who had to be remoulded and to raise their political consciousness; third, inactive and backward elements who did not measure up to the standards for Party membership; and fourth, alien class elements, renegades, political speculators and degenerates who had hidden in the Party.

⁴ "Removing rocks" was advocated by Liu Shao-chi in 1948 during the agrarian reform and Party consolidation in the liberated areas. He maligned large numbers of rural cadres as "rocks" weighing down on the peasants and wanted to have them removed from their posts and expelled from the Party.

THE PARTY'S MASS LINE MUST BE FOLLOWED IN SUPPRESSING COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES

May 1951

I. The movement to suppress counter-revolutionaries now going on throughout the country is a great, intense and complex struggle. The line for this work that has proved effective everywhere is the Party's mass line. This means leadership by Party committees, mobilization of the entire Party membership, mobilization of the masses, participation by the democratic parties and by personages from all circles, unified planning, unified action, strict examination of the lists of persons to be arrested or executed, attention to tactics in different phases of the struggle, widespread propaganda and education (holding various kinds of conferences, cadre meetings, forums and mass rallies, at all of which victims can bring their accusations and evidence of crimes can be displayed, and making propaganda through films, lantern-slides, stage performances, newspapers, pamphlets and leaflets, in order to make the movement known to every household and individual), a break with the practice of working behind closed doors and being secretive, and determined opposition to the deviation of rashness. Wherever this line is completely adhered to, the work is completely correct. Wherever this line is not adhered to, the work is wrong. Wherever this line is adhered to generally but not completely, the work is generally but not completely correct. We believe this line for the work is a guarantee for deepening the struggle to suppress counter-revolutionaries and for achieving full success. In the days ahead it is essential to adhere completely to this line in suppressing counter-revolutionaries. What is most important here is strictly to examine the

Instructions added by Comrade Mao Tsetung when he revised the draft resolution of the Third National Conference on Public Security.

lists of persons to be arrested or executed and to do a good job of widespread propaganda and education. Do both well and mistakes will be avoided.

2. The number of counter-revolutionaries to be killed must be kept within certain proportions. The principle to follow here is that those who owe blood debts or are guilty of other extremely serious crimes and have to be executed to assuage the people's anger and those who have caused extremely serious harm to the national interest must be unhesitatingly sentenced to death and executed without delay. As for those whose crimes deserve capital punishment but who owe no blood debts and are not bitterly hated by the people or who have done serious but not extremely serious harm to the national interest, the policy to follow is to hand down the death sentence, grant a two-year reprieve and subject them to forced labour to see how they behave. In addition, it must be explicitly stipulated that in cases where it is marginal whether to make an arrest, under no circumstances should there be an arrest and that to act otherwise would be a mistake, and that in cases where it is marginal whether to execute, under no circumstances should there be an execution and that to act otherwise would be a mistake.

3. To prevent "Left" deviations in the heat of the movement to suppress counter-revolutionaries, it has been decided that as of June 1, in all localities across the country, including those places where very few executions have so far been carried out, the power to sanction arrests shall without exception revert to the prefectural authorities and the power to sanction executions shall without exception revert to the provincial authorities, who shall send representatives to deal with such cases in places remote from the provincial capital. No locality is to ask for modification of this decision.

4. As of now it is necessary to start a planned screening of counter-revolutionaries hidden in the "middle layer" and the "inner layer". In accordance with the directive of the Central Committee it has been decided that a preliminary screening in the form of rectification will be conducted this summer and autumn among all the personnel who have been retained since liberation and among the intellectuals recently drawn into our work. The aim is to size up the situation and deal with a number of conspicuous cases. The procedure to follow is to study documents on the suppression of counter-revolutionaries, call on those among the above-mentioned personnel and intellectuals (not all of them) whose records are questionable to adopt a sincere and honest

attitude, give a clear account of their history and make a clean breast of what they have hitherto kept to themselves. This campaign to "clear oneself" must be put in charge of the leading member of the organization concerned; the voluntary principle must be applied and coercion must not be used. For each organization the duration should be short, not drawn out. The tactics to adopt are to win over the many and isolate the few, in preparation for a further screening in the winter. This screening must first be conducted in the leading organs, the public security organs and other sensitive departments, and then the experience gained should be popularized. During such screening in government departments, schools and factories, it is necessary to have non-Party people sit on the committees in charge of this work so as to avoid having Party members act in isolation.

5. In the current great struggle to suppress counter-revolutionaries public security committees must be organized among the masses everywhere. Such committees should be elected by the people in every township in the countryside and in every department and organization, school, factory and neighbourhood in the cities. The number of committee members may be as small as three and as large as eleven and must include reliable non-Party patriots so as to make the committee a united front type of organization for safeguarding public security. Under the leadership of the government and public security organs at the basic level, such committees have the responsibility of assisting the people's government in eliminating counter-revolutionaries, guarding against traitors and spies and safeguarding our national and public security. Their establishment must proceed in a well-guided way in those rural areas where the agrarian reform has been completed or in cities where the work of suppressing counter-revolutionaries is well under way, so as to prevent bad elements from seizing the opportunity to worm their way in.

STRIKE SURELY, ACCURATELY AND RELENTLESSLY IN SUPPRESSING COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES

December 1950 — September 1951

1

Please make certain that you strike surely, accurately and relentlessly in suppressing the counter-revolutionaries.

(December 19, 1950)

2

One batch of bandit chieftains, local tyrants and secret agents has been executed in twenty-one counties in western Hunan, and another batch is to be executed by local authorities this year. I think measures of this kind are absolutely necessary. For only thus can we deflate the enemy's arrogance and raise the people's morale. If we are weak and irresolute, if we are tolerant and indulgent, it will bring harm to the people and alienate us from the masses.

To strike surely means to pay attention to tactics. To strike accurately means to avoid wrong executions. To strike relentlessly means resolutely to kill all such reactionary elements as deserve the death penalty (of course, those who don't will not be executed). So long as we avoid wrong executions, we don't have to worry even if the bourgeoisie raises an outcry.

(January 17, 1951)

Important directives concerning the movement to suppress counter-revolutionaries drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

3

In Shantung there is lethargy in some places and rashness in others. Generally speaking, both these deviations are to be found in all the provinces and cities in the country and attention should be paid to setting them right. In particular, rashness presents the major danger. For by education and persuasion those who are lethargic can eventually become active, and it doesn't make much difference if a counter-revolutionary is put to death a few days sooner or a few days later. But being rash and making wrong arrests and executions will produce very bad effects. Please exercise strict control over the work of suppressing counter-revolutionaries, and be sure to proceed with caution and correct any deviation of rashness in handling the job. We must suppress all counter-revolutionaries, but on no account should we make wrong arrests or executions.

(March 30, 1951)

4

In regard to the counter-revolutionaries ferreted out in the Communist Party, People's Liberation Army and organs of the People's Government and in educational, industrial and commercial and religious circles, democratic parties and people's organizations, the Central Committee has decided as follows. Whereas those whose crimes do not deserve the death penalty shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or various prison terms or put under public supervision and surveillance, with respect to all counter-revolutionaries deserving capital punishment execution shall be confined to those who owe blood debts, or who have committed other major crimes which evoke public indignation, such as frequent rape or the plundering of large amounts of property, or who have done extremely serious harm to the national interest, while the policy towards the rest shall be one of passing the death sentence, granting a two-year reprieve and subjecting them to forced labour during this period to see how they behave. This is a prudent policy, a policy that can avoid mistakes. It can win a favourable response from people in all walks of life. It can disintegrate the counter-revolutionary forces and contribute towards the thorough elimination

of counter-revolution. Moreover, it can save a large pool of labour-power, which will be conducive to our national construction. Therefore it is a correct policy. Of all the counter-revolutionaries deserving death who are ferreted out in the above-mentioned Party, government, military, educational, industrial and commercial and people's organizations, it is estimated that those who owe blood debts, those who have committed other crimes which evoke public indignation and those who have done extremely serious harm to the national interest make up only a small number, roughly 10 to 20 per cent, while those to be sentenced to death but to be granted a reprieve probably account for 80 to 90 per cent, that is to say, 80 to 90 per cent may be saved. These counter-revolutionaries differ from the bandit chieftains, hardened brigands and local tyrants in the rural areas, from the local tyrants, bandit chieftains, hardened brigands, leaders of criminal gangs and heads of reactionary secret societies in the cities, and also from certain secret agents who have done extremely serious harm to the national interest in that they have contracted no blood debts or committed no other major crimes that incur the deep hatred of the masses. The harm they did to the national interest, while serious enough, had not yet reached an extreme. They have committed capital offences, but the masses were not the direct victims. If we have such people executed, it will not be easily understood by the masses, nor will the response from public figures be so favourable; at the same time it will deprive us of a large pool of labour-power and will not serve to split the enemy ranks; besides, we may make mistakes on this question. Therefore, towards such persons the Central Committee has decided on a policy of passing the death sentence with a reprieve and subjecting them to forced labour to see how they behave. If some are beyond reform and continue their wrongdoing, they can be executed later on, as the initiative is in our hands. All the local authorities are asked to adhere to the foregoing principle in dealing with the counter-revolutionaries uncovered in the Party, government, military, educational, industrial and commercial and people's organizations. As a precaution, the very small number of executions to be carried out (amounting to roughly 10 to 20 per cent of all those sentenced to death) must without exception be reported to the greater administrative areas or the greater military areas for approval. As for prominent figures whose execution might affect our united front work, approval must be obtained from the central authorities. In the case of counter-revolutionaries in the rural areas, we shall likewise put to death only those whose execution is

necessary to assuage the people's anger, and none shall be executed unless the people so demand. To some we should similarly apply the policy of passing the death sentence with a reprieve. But persons whose death is demanded by the people must be executed so as to assuage their anger and help production.

(May 8, 1951)

5

In no circumstances should the policy of "granting a two-year reprieve" be taken to mean not executing those criminals who owe blood debts or are guilty of other major crimes when their execution is demanded by the people. This would be wrong. We must make it clear to the district and village cadres and the masses that persons who have incurred the bitter hatred of one and all for their heinous crimes and have to be executed to assuage the people's anger must be put to death for this purpose. It is only on those counter-revolutionaries who are guilty of capital offences but have not incurred deep popular hatred and whose execution is not demanded by the people that we shall pass the death sentence with a two-year reprieve and impose forced labour to see how they behave.

(June 15, 1951)

6

The work of suppressing counter-revolutionaries must be placed entirely under the unified leadership of the Party committees at all levels, and the responsible comrades of all public security and other organs associated with this work must, as always, unreservedly accept this leadership.

(September 10, 1951)

PAY SERIOUS ATTENTION TO
THE DISCUSSION OF THE FILM
THE LIFE OF WU HSUN

May 20, 1951

The question raised by *The Life of Wu Hsun* is fundamental in nature. A fellow like Wu Hsun,¹ living as he did towards the end of the Ching Dynasty in an era of great struggle by the Chinese people against foreign aggressors and domestic reactionary feudal rulers, did not lift a finger against the feudal economic base or its superstructure; on the contrary, he strove fanatically to spread feudal culture and, in order to gain a position for this purpose previously beyond his reach, he fawned in every way on the reactionary feudal rulers — ought we to praise such disgusting behaviour? How can we tolerate praising it to the masses, especially when such praise flaunts the revolutionary banner of “serving the people” and when the failure of revolutionary peasant struggles is used as a foil to accentuate the praise? To approve or tolerate such praise is to approve or tolerate abuse of the revolutionary struggles of the peasants, abuse of Chinese history, abuse of the Chinese nation, and to regard such reactionary propaganda as justified.

The appearance of the film *The Life of Wu Hsun*, and particularly the spate of praise lavished on Wu Hsun and the film, show how ideologically confused our country’s cultural circles have become!

In the view of many writers, history proceeds not by the new superseding the old, but by preserving the old from extinction through all kinds of exertion, not by waging class struggle to overthrow the reactionary feudal rulers who ought to be overthrown, but by negating the class struggle of the oppressed and submitting to these rulers in the manner of Wu Hsun. Our writers do not bother to study history

Abridged text of an editorial written for the *People’s Daily*.

and learn who were the enemies oppressing the Chinese people and whether there was anything commendable about those who submitted to these enemies and worked for them. Nor do they bother to find out what new economic formations of society, new class forces, new personalities and ideas have emerged in China during the century and more since the Opium War of 1840 in the struggle against the old economic formations and their superstructures (politics, culture, etc.) before they decide what to commend and praise, what not to, and what to oppose.

Certain Communists who have allegedly grasped Marxism merit special attention. They have studied the history of social development — historical materialism — but when it comes to specific historical events, specific historical figures (like Wu Hsun) and specific ideas which run counter to the trend of history (as in the film *The Life of Wu Hsun* and the writings about Wu Hsun), they lose their critical faculties, and some have even capitulated to these reactionary ideas. Isn't it a fact that reactionary bourgeois ideas have found their way into the militant Communist Party? Where on earth is the Marxism which certain Communists claim to have grasped?

For the above reasons, it is imperative to unfold discussion on the film *The Life of Wu Hsun* and on the essays and other writings about Wu Hsun and thereby thoroughly clarify the confused thinking on this question.

NOTES

¹ Wu Hsun (1838-96), born in Tangyi, Shantung Province, was originally a vagrant. Using the slogan of "schools through alms", he went about cheating people out of their money, bought land and lent money and eventually became a big landlord and usurer. He ganged up with despotic landlords to set up a few so-called "tuition-free schools" in which he fanatically spread feudal culture and trained lackeys for the exploiting class, thus winning praise from reactionary rulers of successive regimes.

LONG LIVE THE GREAT UNITY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE!

October 23, 1949

Fellow Committee Members and Comrades,

The Third Session of the First National Committee of our People's Political Consultative Conference is now open. Besides members of the National Committee, there are present at this session specially invited representatives of the Chinese People's Volunteers and the People's Liberation Army, model workers in industry and agriculture, delegates from the old base areas, workers in education, literature and art, industrialists and businessmen, experts in various fields, representatives of religious circles, minority nationalities, overseas Chinese, women and youth, representatives from provincial and municipal consultative committees, etc., as well as many government personnel. The members attending this session and those invited to sit in include many publicly acclaimed combat heroes and model workers in industry, agriculture and other fields. The size and scope of this session amply indicate that the People's Republic of China has registered tremendous achievements and progress on every front.

Since last year we have unfolded three large-scale movements in the country, the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, the agrarian reform movement and the movement to suppress counter-revolutionaries, and we have won great victories. By and large, the remnant counter-revolutionaries on the mainland will soon be eliminated. Agrarian reform will be completed in 1952, except in some areas inhabited by minority nationalities. In the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, the Chinese people are more broadly united than ever before and are waging a determined struggle against

Opening address at the Third Session of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

the U.S. imperialist forces of aggression. Embodying the mighty will of the Chinese people, the Chinese People's Volunteers have joined forces with the Korean People's Army in smashing U.S. imperialism's mad scheme to overrun and occupy the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and then to invade China's mainland; thus the peace-loving people of Korea, China, Asia and the world have been inspired and made more confident in their defence of peace and resistance to aggression. We should extend our congratulations and pay tribute to the heroic Chinese People's Volunteers and Korean People's Army!

Thanks to victories in these three mass movements and to the joint efforts of the people's governments at all levels and of every section of the population, our country has achieved unprecedented unity. The question of Tibet has been solved by peaceful means. Our national defence has been strengthened. The people's democratic dictatorship has been consolidated. Our currency and commodity prices have remained stable, and our work of rehabilitation and development in the spheres of economic construction, culture and education has also taken a big stride forward.

On the industrial and agricultural fronts the growing patriotic movement to increase production is a new phenomenon in our country which calls for rejoicing. The agrarian reform in the countryside and the democratic reform in factories and other enterprises enable our workers and peasants both to display tremendous enthusiasm in their patriotic efforts to increase production and to improve their material and cultural life. If we are good at uniting with the workers and peasants, educating and relying on them, there is bound to be a nation-wide upsurge in the patriotic movement to increase production.

On our cultural and educational front and among all types of intellectuals, a movement for self-education and self-remoulding is unfolding on a broad scale in accordance with the principles laid down by the Central People's Government, and this too is a new phenomenon in our country which calls for rejoicing. At the close of the Second Session of the National Committee I suggested the use of criticism and self-criticism in self-education and self-remoulding. This suggestion is being steadily translated into action. Ideological remoulding, primarily that of all types of intellectuals, is an important condition for the completion of democratic reforms in all fields and the gradual industrialization of our country. We therefore wish still greater successes to the movement for self-education and self-remoulding as it goes steadily forward.

All facts prove that this system of ours, the people's democratic dictatorship, is vastly superior to the political systems of the capitalist countries. Under this system, the people of our country are able to tap their inexhaustible strength. And such strength is invincible before any enemy.

The great struggle to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea is going on and must go on until the U.S. government is willing to come to a peaceful settlement. We have no intention of encroaching on any country; it is aggression against our country by the imperialists that we oppose. As everyone knows, the Chinese people would not be fighting the U.S. forces if they had not occupied our Taiwan, invaded the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and pushed on to our northeastern borders. But since the U.S. aggressors have launched their attack against us, we cannot but raise the banner of resistance to aggression. This is absolutely necessary and perfectly just, and the whole nation understands that it is so. To press on with this struggle, which is as necessary as it is just, we must continue to stiffen our efforts in resisting U.S. aggression and aiding Korea and must increase production and practise economy to support the Chinese People's Volunteers. This is the central task of the Chinese people today and accordingly the central task of our present session.

We have long been on record as maintaining that the Korean question should be settled by peaceful means, and this is still our position. If the U.S. government is willing to settle the question on a fair and reasonable basis instead of undermining and obstructing the progress of the negotiations in various underhand ways as it has done in the past, it will be possible for the Korean armistice negotiations to be concluded successfully; otherwise it will be impossible.

In the two years since the founding of the People's Republic of China, we have won great victories in all fields of work. We have won these victories by relying on all the forces that can be united. Within the country, we have relied on the firm unity of all the nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties, people's organizations and patriotic democrats under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party. Internationally, we have relied on the firm unity of the camp of peace and democracy headed by the Soviet Union and on the profound sympathy of the peace-loving people throughout the world. Hence our great victories in all spheres of work, which was not what our enemies had expected. Our enemies thought that since the new-born People's Republic of China

was faced with a lot of difficulties and since on top of that they were launching a war of aggression against us, we would not be able to overcome our difficulties or deal counter-blows to the aggressors. Contrary to their expectation, we have proved able to overcome our difficulties, deal counter-blows to the aggressors and win great victories. Our enemies are short-sighted, they fail to realize that our great domestic and international unity is strong and that the founding of the People's Republic of China has once and for all put an end to the days when the Chinese people could be bullied by foreign imperialists. Nor do they realize that the birth of the socialist Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies, the firm unity between the two great countries of China and the Soviet Union anchored in the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, the firm unity of the entire camp of peace and democracy and the profound sympathy of the peace-loving people of the world for this great camp have ended for good the era in which imperialism could dominate the world. Our enemies fail to see all this and still want to bully the People's Republic of China and dominate the world. But, comrades, I can say with confidence that their design is futile, crazy, impossible of achievement. Contrary to their thinking, the People's Republic of China will brook no bullying, the great peace camp headed by the Soviet Union will brook no encroachment, and the peace-loving people of the world will not be deceived. Comrades, the victory of the great October Socialist Revolution has made it certain that the people of the world will win victory, and today this prospect becomes nearer and more certain with the birth of the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies. It is true that, in the historical period following World War I and the October Revolution in Russia, three imperialist states — Germany, Italy and Japan — made attempts to dominate the world; this happened before the founding of the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies. But what came of it? Didn't the attempts of the three imperialist states prove to be futile and crazy? Didn't the results turn out to be just the opposite of what they wanted? Didn't the imperialists who aimed at domination get struck down themselves? Today things are entirely different; the great People's Republic of China has been founded, the People's Democracies have been established, the level of political consciousness of the people of the world has been raised, the struggle for national liberation has been surging ahead all over Asia and in North Africa, the strength of the imperialist

bloc as a whole has been profoundly weakened and, what is of vital importance, the strength of the Soviet Union, our closest ally, has been greatly enhanced. In these circumstances, isn't the outcome quite predictable if any imperialist country tries to follow in the footsteps of the three aggressors, Germany, Italy and Japan? In a word, the world from now on must be a world that belongs to the people, with the people of each country governing themselves, and definitely not a world where imperialism and its lackeys can continue to ride roughshod. I hope that the people of our country will closely unite, that they will closely unite with our ally the Soviet Union, with all the People's Democracies and with all nations and peoples of the world that sympathize with us, and march forward to victory in the struggle against aggression, to victory in building our great country, to victory in the defence of a lasting world peace. Comrades, I am confident that, so long as we do all this, victory will decidedly be ours.

ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE “THREE EVILS” AND THE “FIVE EVILS”¹

November 1951 — March 1952

1

The struggle against corruption and waste is a major issue which concerns the whole Party, and we have told you to give it your serious attention. We need to have a good clean-up in the whole Party, which will thoroughly uncover all cases of corruption, whether major, medium or minor, and aim the main blows at the most corrupt, while following the policy of educating and remoulding the medium and minor embezzlers so that they will not relapse. Only thus can we check the grave danger of many Party members being corroded by the bourgeoisie, put an end to a situation already foreseen at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee and carry out the principle of combating corrosion then laid down. Be sure to give all this your attention.

(November 30, 1951)

2

Particular attention must be paid to the fact that the corrosion of cadres by the bourgeoisie results in serious cases of corruption. Be sure to detect, expose and punish those involved and to take this as a major struggle.

(November 30, 1951)

Important directives drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

3

The struggle against corruption, waste and bureaucracy should be stressed as much as the struggle to suppress counter-revolutionaries. As in the latter, the broad masses, including the democratic parties and also people in all walks of life, should be mobilized, the present struggle should be given wide publicity, the leading cadres should take personal charge and pitch in, and people should be called on to make a clean breast of their own wrongdoing and to report on the guilt of others. In minor cases the guilty should be criticized and educated; in major ones the guilty should be dismissed from office, punished, or sentenced to prison terms (to be reformed through labour), and the worst among them should be shot. The problem can only be solved in these ways.

(December 8, 1951)

4

In all cities, and first of all in the big and medium-sized cities, we should rely on the working class and unite with the law-abiding capitalists and other sections of the urban population to wage a large-scale, resolute and thoroughgoing struggle against those capitalists who are violating the law by bribery, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing economic information; we should co-ordinate this struggle with that against corruption, waste and bureaucracy, which is being waged inside the Party, government, army and mass organizations. This is both imperative and very timely. In the struggle, Party organizations in all cities must carefully dispose the forces of the classes and masses and adopt the tactics of utilizing contradictions, effecting splits, uniting with the many and isolating the few so that in the process a united front against the "five evils" will speedily take shape. In a big city, as the struggle against the "five evils" gets into full swing, such a united front may well come into being within about three weeks. Once this united front is formed, those reactionary capitalists guilty of the worst crimes will be isolated, and the state will be in a strong position to mete out due punishment, such as fines, confiscation, arrest, imprisonment or

execution, without much opposition. All our big cities (including provincial capitals) should start the struggle against the “five evils” in the first ten days of February. Please make prompt arrangements.

(January 26, 1952)

5

(1) In the movement against the “five evils” the basic principles in dealing with industrial and commercial units are: leniency for past offences and severity for new ones (for instance, payment of taxes that have been evaded is generally retroactive only to 1951); leniency towards the many and severity towards the few; leniency towards those owning up to their crimes and severity towards those refusing to do so; leniency for industry and severity for commerce; and leniency for commerce in general and severity for commercial speculation. The Party committees at all levels are asked to adhere to these principles in the movement against the “five evils”.

(2) For the purpose of the movement against the “five evils” private industrial and commercial units should be classified into five categories: the law-abiding, the basically law-abiding, those that partly abide by the law and partly break it, those that break the law on a serious scale, and those that completely violate the law. As far as the big cities are concerned, the first three categories make up about 95 per cent and the last two about 5 per cent. The percentages for different big cities are roughly the same, with only small variations. As for medium-sized cities, the percentages differ considerably from these figures.

(3) These five categories apply to the capitalists and the non-capitalist independent handicraftsmen and family traders, but not to the street vendors. In big cities the street vendors may be left alone for the time being, but the independent handicraftsmen and family traders had better be dealt with. In medium-sized cities it would be better to deal with both the independent handicraftsmen and traders and the street vendors in this movement. In our big and medium-sized cities there are large numbers of independent handicraftsmen and traders who do not employ workers or shop assistants (though some have apprentices). Many of them are law-abiding, many others basically abide by the law but partly break it (*i.e.*, they have minor offences

to account for, such as small-scale evasion of taxes), and a small number partly abide by the law and partly break it and have evaded taxes on a larger scale. In the current movement against the "five evils" we must deal with a considerable number of small capitalists and pass judgment on them, and as far as possible do likewise with the independent handicraftsmen and traders, who roughly equal the small capitalists in number. This will be to the advantage of the current movement and to economic construction in the days ahead. The small capitalists as well as the independent handicraftsmen and traders are generally innocent of serious offences, and it is not difficult to pass judgment on them. In so acting, we shall win support from the masses. However, if a few cities think it convenient to pass judgment first on industrial and commercial units other than the independent handicraftsmen and traders and defer judgment on the latter, that is in order, too.

(4) In view of the actual situation in the cities we have decided to reclassify industrial and commercial units into five categories instead of four as in the past, *i.e.*, those in the law-abiding category are to be reclassified into law-abiding and basically law-abiding, while the other three categories remain unchanged. Out of the fifty thousand industrial and commercial units in Peking (including the independent handicraftsmen and traders, but not the street vendors), the law-abiding ones make up about 10 per cent, the basically law-abiding ones about 60 per cent, those that partly abide by the law and partly break it about 25 per cent, those that break the law on a serious scale about 4 per cent and those that completely violate the law about 1 per cent. To distinguish between the strictly law-abiding ones and the basically law-abiding ones with minor offences and, furthermore, to treat the basically law-abiding units guilty of small-scale tax evasion differently from those guilty on a larger scale may prove to have important educational value.

(5) In some big and medium-sized cities, the city Party committees launched the movement against the "five evils" in a hurry, when they were not at all acquainted with the situation with respect to the different categories of industrial and commercial units and were not clear about the tactics of differential treatment, and when the work teams (or investigation groups) sent by the trade unions and the government had been organized and trained in a very slipshod way. As a result some confusion has arisen. It is hoped that the city Party committees concerned will pay attention to this situation and see to its correction without delay.

Moreover, the investigation of industrial and commercial units which break the law must be made under the strict control of the city Party committee and the city government. No other organization is allowed to send out people to investigate on its own, much less to haul capitalists into its office for interrogation. Whether in the movement against the "three evils" or in that against the "five evils", the use of torture to extort confessions is forbidden and strict precautions must be taken to prevent suicides. Where suicides have occurred, measures for preventing their further occurrence should be worked out immediately to ensure that both movements will develop soundly and on the right track and that complete victory will be won.

(6) The movements against the "three evils" and against the "five evils" are not to be launched at present in counties, districts and townships. Further notice will be given by the Central Committee as to when and how to carry them out. In the few instances where the movement against the "five evils" has been launched at county seats and that against the "three evils" in districts, in both cases experimentally, strict control must be exercised and spring farming and other economic activities must not be hampered. The movement against the "five evils" should not begin in all the medium-sized cities at the same time but should be staggered and strictly controlled.

(March 5, 1952)

6

During and also after the struggle against the "five evils", we must achieve the following aims:

(1) Get thoroughly clear about the situation in private industry and commerce so as the better to unite with and control the bourgeoisie and develop the country's planned economy. Planned economy is impossible unless we are clear about the situation.

(2) Draw a clear line of distinction between the working class and the bourgeoisie, and in trade unions eliminate corruption and bureaucracy which alienates the masses and weed out the capitalists' hirelings. Such hirelings and the middle elements vacillating between labour and capital are to be found in trade unions everywhere, and in the struggle we must educate and win over the middle elements, whereas those hirelings guilty of serious crimes should be expelled.

(3) Reorganize the trade councils and associations of industry and commerce, remove from their leading bodies persons guilty of all the "five evils" and those who have been totally discredited, and in their stead draw in those who have acquitted themselves fairly well in the struggle against these evils. With the exception of those who have completely violated the law, there should be representation of all categories of industrialists and traders.

(4) Help leaders of the China Democratic National Construction Association to conduct a shake-up, to expel those guilty of all the "five evils" and those who have disgraced themselves in the public eye and to recruit a number of better individuals, so that it can become a political organization capable of representing the legitimate interests of the bourgeoisie, mainly the industrial bourgeoisie, and of educating them in the spirit of the Common Programme and in the principles governing the struggle against the "five evils". Take measures to disband the secret organizations of different groups of capitalists, such as the "Thursday Dinner Club".²

(5) Eradicate the "five evils" and eliminate commercial speculation so that the entire bourgeoisie will obey the laws and decrees of the state and engage in industrial and commercial activities beneficial to the nation's economy and the people's livelihood. Develop private industry within the limits set by the state (provided the capitalists so wish and its operations conform with the Common Programme), and reduce private commerce step by step. Expand the state's plan to monopolize the sales and contracts of private industry year by year and at the same time extend the coverage of our plan over private industry and commerce. Set new percentages of profit for private capital so that it will be able to make some profits but not exorbitant ones.

(6) Do away with hidden accounts, make the accounts public and gradually establish a system under which the workers and shop assistants supervise production and management.

(7) Recover the greater part of the economic losses to the state and the people through the payment of evaded taxes, restitution, fines and confiscation.

(8) Set up Party branches among workers and shop assistants in all large and medium-sized private enterprises and strengthen Party work.

(March 5, 1952)

NOTES

¹The movement against the “three evils” was the struggle against corruption, waste and bureaucracy launched at the end of 1951 among the personnel of government departments and state enterprises. The movement against the “five evils” was the struggle against bribery, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing of economic information started at the beginning of 1952 among owners of private industrial and commercial enterprises.

²The “Thursday Dinner Club” was a secret organization of some capitalists in Chungking, which engaged in surreptitious activities in grave violation of the law. It was exposed and banned in the movement against the “five evils”.

TAKE MUTUAL AID AND CO-OPERATION IN AGRICULTURE AS A MAJOR TASK

December 15, 1951

Herewith is the Draft Resolution on Mutual Aid and Co-operation in Agricultural Production which you are requested to print for distribution right down to the county and district Party committees. Please give prompt explanations inside and outside the Party in the spirit of this draft and arrange for its implementation. This is to be done in all areas where the agrarian reform has been completed, and please take it as a major task. This draft resolution may appear in inner-Party publications but not in newspapers and periodicals for general circulation, as it is still a draft.

Inner-Party circular of historic significance to rebuff Liu Shao-chi's opposition to the co-operative transformation of agriculture. In July 1951, behind the backs of Comrade Mao Tsetung and the Party Central Committee, Liu Shao-chi wrote and distributed a comment in his own name, wantonly attacking a report submitted by the Shansi Provincial Party Committee on promoting mutual aid and co-operation in agricultural production. In this comment, he opposed Comrade Mao Tsetung's line on the socialist transformation of agriculture, maligning it as an "erroneous, dangerous and utopian notion of agrarian socialism". In September of the same year, Comrade Mao Tsetung personally took charge of drafting the "Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Mutual Aid and Co-operation in Agricultural Production (Draft)", and on December 15 when the draft resolution was to be distributed he wrote this circular and instructed the whole Party to take mutual aid and co-operation in agriculture as a major task.

NEW YEAR'S DAY MESSAGE

January 1, 1952

May all of us — the cadres of the People's Government, the commanders and fighters of the People's Volunteers and the People's Liberation Army, the democratic parties, the people's organizations, the minority nationalities and the people of the entire country — win victory on every front of our work!

May we win victory on the front of our movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea!

Victory on the national defence front!

Victory on the agrarian reform front!

Victory on the front of our movement to suppress counter-revolutionaries!

Victory on the economic and financial front!

Victory on the cultural and educational front!

Victory on the front of the ideological remoulding of people in all walks of life, and primarily of the intellectuals!

I would also like to wish victory to a new front, that is, to the large-scale struggle in which all the people and cadres of the country are called upon to fight vigorously and resolutely against corruption, waste and bureaucracy, so as to cleanse our society of all the filth and poison left over from the old!

Comrades, in 1951 we scored victories, many of them very great ones, on all these fronts. We hope that by our common efforts we shall win still greater victories in all these tasks in 1952.

Long live the People's Republic of China!

ON THE POLICIES
FOR OUR WORK IN TIBET —
DIRECTIVE OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

April 6, 1952

The Central Committee essentially approves the instructions which the Southwest Bureau and the Southwest Military Area cabled on April 2 to the Working Committee and Military Area in Tibet. It holds that the basic policies (except the point about reorganizing the Tibetan troops) and the various specific steps set forth in the telegram are correct. Only by following them can our army establish itself in an invulnerable position in Tibet.

Conditions in Tibet are different from those in Sinkiang. Tibet compares poorly with Sinkiang, whether politically or economically. But even in Sinkiang, the first thing the army units under Wang Chen did when they got there was to pay the utmost attention to strict budgeting, self-reliance and production for their own needs. They have now gained a firm foothold and won the warm support of the minority nationalities. They are carrying out the reduction of rent and interest and will proceed to agrarian reform this winter, and by then we can be sure of even greater support from the masses. Sinkiang is well connected with the heartland of the country by motor roads, and this is of great help in improving the material welfare of the minority nationalities. As for Tibet, neither rent reduction nor agrarian reform can start for at least two or three years. While several hundred thousand Han people live in Sinkiang, there are hardly any in Tibet, where our army finds itself in a totally different minority nationality

Inner-Party directive drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. It was sent to the Southwest Bureau and the Working Committee in Tibet and communicated to the Northwest Bureau and the Sinkiang Sub-Bureau.

area. We depend solely on two basic policies to win over the masses and put ourselves in an invulnerable position. The first is strict budgeting coupled with production for the army's own needs, and thus the exertion of influence on the masses; this is the key link. Even when highways are built, we cannot count on moving large quantities of grain over them. India will probably agree to send grain and other goods to Tibet on the basis of exchange, but the stand we must take is that our army should be able to carry on even if India stops sending them some day. We must do our best and take proper steps to win over the Dalai and the majority of his top echelon and to isolate the handful of bad elements in order to achieve a gradual, bloodless transformation of the Tibetan economic and political system over a number of years; on the other hand, we must be prepared for the eventuality of the bad elements leading the Tibetan troops in rebellion and attacking us, so that in this contingency our army could still carry on and hold out in Tibet. It all depends on strict budgeting and production for the army's own needs. Only with this fundamental policy as the cornerstone of our work can we achieve our aim. The second policy, which can and must be put into effect, is to establish trade relations with India and with the heartland of our country and to attain a general balance in supplies to and from Tibet so that the standard of living of the Tibetan people will in no way fall because of our army's presence but will improve through our efforts. If we cannot solve the two problems of production and trade, we shall lose the material base for our presence, the bad elements will cash in and will not let a single day pass without inciting the backward elements among the people and the Tibetan troops to oppose us, and our policy of uniting with the many and isolating the few will become ineffectual and fail.

Of all the views set forth in the Southwest Bureau's telegram of April 2 there is only one that calls for further consideration; what I refer to is the feasibility and advisability of reorganizing the Tibetan troops and setting up a military and administrative commission fairly soon. It is our opinion that the Tibetan troops should not be reorganized at present, nor should formal military sub-areas or a military and administrative commission be established. For the time being, leave everything as it is, let this situation drag on, and do not take up these questions until our army is able to meet its own needs through production and wins the support of the masses a year or two from now. In the meantime there are two possibilities. One is that our united front

policy towards the upper stratum, a policy of uniting with the many and isolating the few, will take effect and that the Tibetan people will gradually draw closer to us, so the bad elements and the Tibetan troops will not dare to rebel. The other possibility is that the bad elements, thinking we are weak and can be bullied, may lead the Tibetan troops in rebellion and that our army will counter-attack in self-defence and deal them telling blows. Either will be favourable for us. As the top echelon in Tibet sees it, there is no sufficient reason now for implementing the Agreement¹ in its entirety or for reorganizing the Tibetan troops. But things will be different in a few years. By then they will probably and that they have no choice but to carry out the Agreement to the full and to reorganize the Tibetan troops. If the Tibetan troops start one or even several rebellions and are repulsed by our army each time, we will be all the more justified in reorganizing them. Apparently not only the two Silons² but also the Dalai and most of his clique were reluctant to accept the Agreement and are unwilling to carry it out. As yet we don't have a material base for fully implementing the Agreement, nor do we have a base for this purpose in terms of support among the masses or in the upper stratum. To force its implementation will do more harm than good. Since they are unwilling to put the Agreement into effect, well then, we can leave it for the time being and wait. The longer the delay, the stronger will be our position and the weaker theirs. Delay will not do us much harm; on the contrary, it may be to our advantage. Let them go on with their insensate atrocities against the people, while we on our part concentrate on good deeds — production, trade, road-building, medical services and united front work (unity with the majority and patient education) so as to win over the masses and bide our time before taking up the question of the full implementation of the Agreement. If they are not in favour of the setting up of primary schools, that can stop too.

The recent demonstration in Lhasa should be viewed not merely as the work of the two Silons and other bad elements but as a signal to us from the majority of the Dalai clique. Their petition is very tactful because it indicates not a wish for a break with us but only a wish for concessions from us. One of the terms gives the hint that the practice of the Ching Dynasty should be restored, in other words, that no Liberation Army units should be stationed in Tibet, but this is not what they are really after. They know full well that this is impossible; their attempt is to trade this term for other terms. The Fourteenth Dalai is criticized in the petition so as to absolve him from

any political responsibility for the demonstration. They pose as protectors of the interests of the Tibetan nationality, being aware that while they are inferior to us in military strength, they have an advantage over us in social influence. We should accept this petition in substance (not in form) and put off the full implementation of the Agreement. The timing of the demonstration to take place before the Panchen's arrival in Lhasa was deliberate. After his arrival they will probably go all out to work on him to join their clique. If on our part we do our work well and the Panchen does not fall into their trap but reaches Shigatse safe and sound, the situation will then become more favourable to us. Nevertheless, since neither our lack of a material base nor their advantage over us in social influence will change for the time being, neither will the unwillingness of the Dalai clique to carry out the Agreement fully. At present, in appearance we should take the offensive and should censure the demonstration and the petition for being unjustifiable (for undermining the Agreement), but in reality we should be prepared to make concessions and to go over to the offensive in the future (*i.e.*, put the Agreement into force) when conditions are ripe.

What are your views? Please consider and wire your reply.

NOTES

¹ This refers to the Agreement Between the Central People's Government and the Local Government of Tibet on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet, May 23, 1951.

² The "Silons" were the highest ranking administrative officials under the Dalai. The two Silons referred to here were the reactionary serf-owners Lukhangwa and Lozang Tashi.

THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN
THE WORKING CLASS AND THE BOURGEOISIE
IS THE PRINCIPAL CONTRADICTION
IN CHINA

June 6, 1952

With the overthrow of the landlord class and the bureaucrat-capitalist class, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie has become the principal contradiction in China; therefore the national bourgeoisie should no longer be defined as an intermediate class.

Written comment on a document drafted by the United Front Work Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. Comrade Mao Tsetung criticized the head of this department for his error in regarding the national bourgeoisie as an intermediate class.

LET US UNITE AND CLEARLY DISTINGUISH BETWEEN OURSELVES AND THE ENEMY

August 4, 1952

We have been simultaneously waging war, holding negotiations and working towards stability for a whole year.

The war situation in Korea became stable after July last year, but at the time we were not sure whether the financial and economic situation at home could be stabilized. We had said, "Prices are basically stable and revenues and expenditures are almost balanced," meaning that prices could not yet be stabilized and that revenues and expenditures were not yet balanced. Expenditures were in excess of revenues, and that was a problem. That is why the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party convened a meeting last September and called for increased production and strict economy. In October, I repeated this call at the Third Session of the First National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference. The subsequent campaign to increase production and practise economy brought to light rather serious cases of corruption, waste and bureaucracy. In December the movement against the "three evils" was launched, and this was followed by the movement against the "five evils". Both these movements have come to a successful conclusion, the situation is now perfectly clear and general stability has been achieved.

Last year, what we spent on the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea more or less equalled our expenditures for national construction; it was fifty-fifty. This year it will be different. It is estimated that the outlays for war will come to only half last year's figure. Our troops are fewer in number but they are better equipped.

Salient points of a speech delivered at the thirty-eighth meeting of the Standing Committee of the First National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

For more than two decades we fought without an air force and we were always on the receiving end of enemy bombing. Now we have an air force of our own, and anti-aircraft guns, artillery and tanks too. The war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea is a big school for large-scale military exercises, and such exercises are better than a military academy. If the fighting continues through next year, all our land forces will have had their spell of military training in Korea.

In this war we were confronted with three problems at the start: first, our ability to fight, second, our ability to hold out and, third, our ability to feed ourselves.

The problem of our ability to fight was solved within the first two or three months. The enemy had more artillery, but their morale was low; they were rich in metal but poor in morale.

The problem of our ability to hold out was also solved last year. Our answer was to dig tunnels. We constructed two tiers of defence works. When the enemy attacked, we got into the tunnels. Sometimes the enemy occupied the positions overhead, but what lay below remained in our hands. When they were in our positions, we counter-attacked, inflicting heavy casualties on them. We used this homespun method to collect foreign guns. The enemy was entirely at a loss as to how to cope with us.

It was quite some time before the problem of food supplies, that is, the problem of ensuring provisions, was solved. At first we did not know that tunnels could be dug to store grain in. Now we know. Each division has grain reserves for three months, its own storage area and a meeting hall to boot, and our men are making a go of life in the tunnels.

Today, our policy is clear and definite, our positions are secure, our provisions ensured, and every soldier knows that he must fight to the end.

Just how long will the fighting go on, and just when will the negotiations draw to a close? I say negotiations will continue, fighting will go on but there will be a truce.

Why is it that there will be a truce? A thirty years' war or a hundred years' war is highly improbable, because a long war is very much against the interests of the United States.

First, the war costs lives. They fought on to hold some ten thousand prisoners of war, only to lose over thirty thousand more lives. After all, they have far fewer men than we.

Second, the war costs money. They are spending far more than ten billion U.S. dollars a year. We spend very much less, and this year we are going to cut our expenditures to half last year's. The money that came from the settling of accounts in the movements against the "three evils" and the "five evils" can see us through another eighteen months of war. And all the money that comes from increased production and the practice of economy can be used for national construction.

Third, they are confronted with insuperable contradictions at home and abroad.

Fourth, there is the strategic problem too. The focus of U.S. strategy is in Europe. They did not anticipate that we would send volunteers to aid Korea when they dispatched forces to invade it.

With us, things are easier to manage. In internal affairs we are masters of our own house. But we are not the chief of staff of the United States. The United States has its own chief of staff. So on the question of whether the Korean war will continue, we and the Koreans have only half the say.

In a word, under the pressure of the general trend, the United States will find it against its interest to refuse to come to a truce.

All the talk about the imminence of a third world war is just to scare people. We must strive to gain a period of ten years for building our industry and laying solid foundations.

We must close our ranks and clearly distinguish between ourselves and the enemy. It is because of the unity of the whole nation and the co-operation of all those present and of all the democratic parties and people's organizations that we are strong today. It is of vital importance that we unite and distinguish between ourselves and the enemy. Dr. Sun Yat-sen was a man of integrity, but why did the Revolution of 1911 he led end in failure? The reasons were: first, failure to distribute land; second, failure to recognize the necessity of suppressing counter-revolutionaries; and, third, failure to wage sharp struggles against imperialism. Apart from distinguishing between ourselves and the enemy, there is the need to distinguish between right and wrong within our own ranks. Compared with the former, the latter is secondary. For instance, with most of the embezzlers, it is just a matter of right and wrong, for they are different from counter-revolutionaries and can be reformed.

It is necessary to carry out education among the democratic parties and in religious circles so that they will not be taken in by the imperialists and stand on the enemy's side. Take Buddhism for

example. It has not much contact with imperialism and its ties are chiefly with feudalism. As the struggle against feudalism involves the land problem, it affects the monks, and those who come under attack are the abbots and elders of the monasteries. Once this small number is overthrown, ordinary monks like "Lu Chih-shen"¹ will be emancipated. Though no believer in Buddhism, I am not against forming an association of Buddhists to get them united and enable them to distinguish clearly between the people and the enemy. Will the united front be abolished some day? I for one am not for its abolition. We should unite with everyone provided he truly makes a clear distinction between the people and the enemy and serves the people.

Our country has a bright future and is full of hope. In the past we wondered if the economy could recover in three years. As a result of two and a half years of hard struggle, it already has, and what is more, planned construction is under way. Let us all unite, clearly distinguish between ourselves and the enemy and strive for the steady progress of our country.

NOTES

¹ A character in the classical Chinese novel *Water Margin*, who is an ordinary Buddhist monk before he joins the peasant army on Liangshan Mountain.

HAIL THE SIGNAL VICTORY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S VOLUNTEERS!

October 24, 1952

Beginning on September 18, our Volunteers, together with the Korean People's Army, initiated tactical counter-attacks on all fronts and have won a signal victory by annihilating and wounding more than thirty thousand enemy troops in the space of a month. The Central Committee and its Military Commission send you and all commanders and fighters hearty congratulations. The operations can be summed up as follows: first, concentrating superior forces and firepower on a number of selected tactically critical points, springing surprise attacks and wiping out the enemy by whole platoons, whole companies, whole battalions or by the larger part of such units; second, inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy in repeated operations as he mounts counter-attacks; and, third, firmly holding those captured strong-points which can be held and abandoning those which cannot according to circumstances, so as to keep the initiative in our hands in preparation for future counter-attacks. If such operations are kept up, we will have the enemy by the throat and force him to come to terms and end the Korean war. The losses inflicted on the enemy since July last year when our forces started tenacious positional warfare have far exceeded those inflicted on him in the many campaigns of mobile warfare before then. On the other hand, our losses have greatly diminished. So far as casualties are concerned, the monthly average, to speak only of our Volunteers, has been reduced by over two-thirds in the fifteen months since July last year, as compared with that in the previous eight months. This is due to the kind of operation mentioned above which is carried out by relying on our positions. In the period since September 18, operations of

Directive to the leading members of the Chinese People's Volunteers drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and its Military Commission.

this kind have been carried out on the whole front more extensively and in a more organized way and therefore they deserve special attention.

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the Chinese People's Volunteers' entry into the war in Korea, we hope you will sum up your experience, further enhance your sense of organization, raise your tactical level and save ammunition, unite more closely with the Korean comrades and people and strive for still greater victories in future operations.

COMBAT BUREAUCRACY, COMMANDISM AND VIOLATIONS OF THE LAW AND OF DISCIPLINE

January 5, 1953

The task of combating bureaucracy, commandism and violations of the law and of discipline should arouse the attention of our leading bodies at all levels.

In the movement against the “three evils”, our Party has basically solved the two problems of corruption and waste among many of our cadres at four levels, the central, the greater administrative area, the provincial and municipal, and the prefectural. It has also basically overcome one kind of bureaucracy, namely, that which alienates many leading cadres from those working under them. But the problem of the following kind of bureaucracy has not been basically solved in many areas, departments and fields of work. Some leading cadres are ignorant of the people’s hardships, of the conditions in subordinate units only a short distance from their offices, and of the fact that among the cadres at the county, district and township levels there are many bad people guilty of commandism and violations of the law and of discipline. Or they may have some knowledge of such bad people and bad deeds, but turn a blind eye to them, feel no indignation, are not aware of the seriousness of the matter and so take no positive measure to back up good people and punish the bad or to encourage good deeds and stop bad ones. To cite the handling of letters from the masses as an example. Reports say that a certain provincial people’s government has sat on well over seventy thousand letters; as for the number of letters shelved by Party and government organizations below the provincial level, we have no idea as yet, but presumably it is by no means small. Most of the letters

Inner-Party directive drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

appeal to us to help solve problems, and many contain accusations against certain cadres whose lawless behaviour requires prompt attention.

For our Party and government, bureaucracy and commandism are a big problem not only for today but for a long time to come. In terms of social origin, it reflects the survival in our Party and government of the reactionary style of work (an anti-popular style of work, a Kuomintang style of work) of the reactionary ruling classes in dealing with the people. As far as the role and methods of leadership of our Party and government organizations are concerned, it means failure to make clear the policy limits and the proper style of work when giving assignments, in other words, failure to give the cadres at the middle and lower levels receiving assignments thorough instructions on these matters. It means failure to make a proper examination, or indeed any examination at all, of cadres at the various levels, particularly at the county, district and township levels. It means failure to carry out Party consolidation work at these three levels or, in cases where Party consolidation has started, failure to launch a struggle to combat commandism and comb out violators of the law and of discipline. It means failure to combat and stamp out the kind of bureaucracy still existing among cadres in the leading organizations at the prefectural level and above, which finds expression in ignorance of and callousness to both the hardships of the masses and the conditions in the grass-roots organizations. If we strengthen and improve our role and methods of leadership, then bureaucracy and commandism, which are harmful to the people, will gradually diminish and many of our Party and government organizations will be able to break away sooner from this Kuomintang style of work. And the sooner will the many bad people who have infiltrated our Party and government organizations be combed out and the many bad deeds still evident today be eliminated.

Therefore, in 1953 starting with the handling of letters from the masses, please make an investigation into bureaucracy, commandism and violations of the law and of discipline and wage a resolute struggle against them in co-ordination with Party consolidation, Party building and other spheres of work. Typical cases of bureaucracy, commandism and violations of the law and of discipline should be widely exposed in the press. Serious offenders should be punished by law, and when they are Party members they should also be dealt with according to Party discipline. Party committees at all levels should make a determined effort to punish and clear out of Party and government

organizations those violators of the law and of discipline who are bitterly hated by the masses, and the worst among them should be executed so as to assuage the people's anger and help educate the cadres and the masses. However, at an appropriate stage of the broad struggle against bad people and bad deeds, we should look into, evaluate and praise models of good people and good deeds in various places so that all Party members will strive to measure up to these fine models and what is upright will prevail over what is evil. We believe that a substantial number of such models are certain to be found in various parts of the country.

CRITICIZE HAN CHAUVINISM

March 16, 1953

In some places the relations between nationalities are far from normal. For Communists this is an intolerable situation. We must go to the root and criticize the Han chauvinist ideas which exist to a serious degree among many Party members and cadres, namely, the reactionary ideas of the landlord class and the bourgeoisie, or the ideas characteristic of the Kuomintang, which are manifested in the relations between nationalities. Mistakes in this respect must be corrected at once. Delegations led by comrades who are familiar with our nationality policy and full of sympathy for our minority nationality compatriots still suffering from discrimination should be sent to visit the areas where there are minority nationalities, make a serious effort at investigation and study and help Party and government organizations in the localities discover and solve problems. The visits should not be those of "looking at flowers on horseback".

Judging from the mass of information on hand, the Central Committee holds that wherever there are minority nationalities the general rule is that there are problems calling for solution, and in some cases very serious ones. On the surface all is quiet, but actually there are some very serious problems. What has come to light in various places in the last two or three years shows that Han chauvinism exists almost everywhere. It will be very dangerous if we fail now to give timely education and resolutely overcome Han chauvinism in the Party and among the people. The problem in the relations between nationalities which reveals itself in the Party and among the people in many places is the existence of Han chauvinism to a serious degree and not just a matter of its vestiges. In other words, bourgeois ideas dominate the minds of those comrades and people who have had

Inner-Party directive drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

no Marxist education and have not grasped the nationality policy of the Central Committee. Therefore, education must be assiduously carried out so that this problem can be solved step by step. Moreover, the newspapers should publish more articles based on specific facts to criticize Han chauvinism openly and educate the Party members and the people.

SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF THE “FIVE EXCESSES”

March 19, 1953

I. In our work in the rural areas there are problems involving the serious alienation of our Party and government organizations from the peasant masses and violations of the interests of the peasants and peasant activists; these are known as the “five excesses”. The “five excesses” consist of an excess of assignments, an excess of meetings and training courses, an excess of documents, written reports and statistical forms, an excess of organizations, and an excess of side jobs for activists. These problems have existed for a long time; with regard to some of them the Central Committee has issued directives to Party committees at various levels, urging them to give such problems proper attention and find solutions. But far from being solved, the problems are becoming more and more serious. This is because the issue has never been systematically raised in its totality and, what is more important, no struggle has ever been waged against decentralism and bureaucracy on the part of the leading Party and government organs at the five levels — central, greater administrative area, provincial (municipal), prefectural and county. For, generally speaking, the “five excesses” in the districts and townships are not a local product but stem from above and are the consequences of decentralism and bureaucracy existing to a serious degree in the leading Party and government organs at the county level and above. Some of the “five excesses” are a legacy of the periods of the revolutionary war and agrarian reform and have remained unchanged to this day. Therefore, in carrying out the Central Committee’s directive to combat bureaucracy, commandism and violations of the law and of discipline, we must put stress on overcoming bureaucracy and decentralism in the leading organs during 1953, and alter those rules and

Inner-Party directive drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

practices which have outlived their usefulness. Only thus can the problems be solved. As for the authority of the leading organs at various levels to assign tasks, call meetings and organize training courses, send out documents and statistical forms or ask for reports from subordinate units, determine the organizational structure of districts and townships and use the activists in the villages, from now on it is up to the leading comrades in charge of the Party committee and government at the county level and above to define the proper limits in the light of what is feasible; in some cases it is up to the central authorities to define the limits for all concerned. In the past, many departments of the Party, government and people's organizations at all levels, each on its own, gave assignments to the subordinate units, casually summoned subordinates and village activists to meetings or training courses, issued floods of documents and statistical forms and thoughtlessly demanded reports from subordinates and villages. All these undesirable rules and practices must be resolutely abolished and replaced by ones that are standardized under the leadership and suited to the needs of the actual situation. As for the great variety of committees in every township and the excess of side jobs for activists, these too should be changed firmly but gradually since they hamper production and alienate the masses.

2. With regard to the departments of the Party, government and people's organizations at the national level, the Central Committee charges the responsible comrades of the Organization Department of the Central Committee, the Administration Council of the Central People's Government and its subsidiary financial and economic, cultural and educational, and political and judicial committees with the task of quickly clearing away all practices that have given rise to the "five excesses", working out appropriate rules and practices and reporting to the Central Committee.

3. In the greater administrative areas and the provinces and municipalities, the comrades in charge of Central Committee bureaus and sub-bureaus, provincial and municipal Party committees and the administrative apparatuses at the corresponding levels are held responsible for tackling the problem of the "five excesses", working out solutions and reporting to the Central Committee. To this end, the Central Committee bureaus and sub-bureaus and the provincial and municipal Party committees are each requested to send out an inspection team for the specific purpose of looking into this problem of the "five excesses" and to review the situation in one or two districts and town-

ships (and in the city, one or two districts and neighbourhoods) under their administration, so as to gather reference material for solutions.

4. The provincial Party committees are held accountable for giving guidance to the prefectures and counties in solving their problem of the "five excesses".

5. Agricultural production is the overriding task in the countryside; to it all other tasks play a supporting role. Any assignment or method of work that hinders the production of the peasants must be avoided. Our present-day agricultural economy remains basically a scattered small peasant economy where old-fashioned implements are used; this is vastly different from the mechanized collective farming of the Soviet Union. Therefore, in the present transition period we cannot introduce unified and planned production in agriculture, except on the state farms, and interfere too much with the peasants. We can only guide agricultural production and co-ordinate it with industrial production by our pricing policy and necessary and practicable economic and political work so that it can be integrated into the national economic plan. Any "plan" for agriculture or any "assignment" for the rural areas which goes beyond this is bound to be unworkable and is certain to evoke peasant opposition and alienate our Party from the peasant masses who constitute over 80 per cent of our population. This can be very dangerous indeed. The problem of the "five excesses" in our work in the districts and townships is in a large measure a reflection of such excessive interference with the peasants (and in a smaller measure a survival of practices that arose out of the needs of the revolutionary war and the agrarian reform). It has aroused their dissatisfaction, so there must be a change.

LIU SHAO-CHI AND YANG SHANG-KUN
CRITICIZED FOR BREACH OF DISCIPLINE
IN ISSUING DOCUMENTS
IN THE NAME OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION

May 19, 1953

1

From now on, all documents and telegrams sent out in the name of the Central Committee can be dispatched only after I have gone over them, *otherwise they are invalid*. Please take note.

2

(1) Please assume responsibility for checking on the telegrams and documents dispatched in the name of the Central Committee or the Military Commission in the period from August 1 last year (those issued before August 1 have been checked) to May 5 this year to see if there are any which I have not gone over and if so how many (not counting those issued during my absence on tours of inspection or on sick leave), and let me know the results.

(2) On several occasions resolutions adopted at meetings called by the Central Committee, which I had not gone over, were issued without authorization. This is a mistake and a breach of discipline.

Comrade Mao Tsetung's written criticisms of Liu Shao-chi and Yang Shang-kun.

REFUTE RIGHT DEVIATIONIST VIEWS THAT DEPART FROM THE GENERAL LINE

June 15, 1953

The general line or the general task of the Party for the transition period¹ is basically to accomplish the industrialization of the country and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce in ten to fifteen years, or a little longer. This general line is a beacon illuminating our work in all fields. Do not depart from this general line, otherwise “Left” or Right mistakes will occur.

Some people think the period of transition is too long and give way to impatience. This will lead to “Left” deviationist mistakes. Others have remained where they were after the victory of the democratic revolution. They fail to realize there is a change in the character of the revolution and they go on pushing their “New Democracy” instead of socialist transformation. This will lead to Right deviationist mistakes. Take our agriculture for instance, the socialist road is the only road for it. The Party’s central task in the rural areas is to develop the mutual-aid and co-operative movement and constantly raise productivity in agriculture.

The Right deviation manifests itself in three remarks:

“Firmly establish the new-democratic social order.” That’s a harmful formulation. In the transition period changes are taking place all the time and socialist factors are emerging every day. How can this “new-democratic social order” be “firmly established”? It would be very difficult indeed to “establish” it “firmly”! For instance, private industry and commerce are being transformed, and if an order is “established”

Part of a speech at a meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. Here Comrade Mao Tsetung refuted the Right opportunist views, such as “firmly establish the new-democratic social order”, put forward by Liu Shao-chi and others.

in the second half of the year, it will no longer hold “firm” next year. And changes are taking place in mutual aid and co-operation in agriculture from year to year too. The period of transition is full of contradictions and struggles. Our present revolutionary struggle is even more profound than the revolutionary armed struggle of the past. It is a revolution that will bury the capitalist system and all other systems of exploitation once and for all. The idea, “Firmly establish the new-democratic social order”, goes against the realities of our struggle and hinders the progress of the socialist cause.

“Move from New Democracy towards socialism.” That’s a vague formulation. Moving towards the goal and nothing more, moving towards it year in year out and still moving towards it after a lapse of fifteen years? Merely moving towards it means that the goal has not been reached. The formulation sounds plausible but does not bear scrutiny.

“Sustain private property.” Since the middle peasants are afraid of “becoming too conspicuous” and having their property “communized”, some people have raised this slogan to put them at ease. But that is not right.

We have proposed a step-by-step transition to socialism. This is a better formulation. When we say “step-by-step”, we mean that the steps are to be spread out over fifteen years and over the twelve months in each year. Going too fast means erring to the “Left”; standing still means erring too much to the Right. We must oppose “Left” and Right deviations and make a step-by-step transition until the whole process is completed.

NOTES

¹ Here “the transition period” refers to the period from the founding of the People’s Republic of China to the basic completion of socialist transformation. The general line or the general task of the Party for this transition period was basically to accomplish the industrialization of China and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce over a fairly long period of time. This transition period is different in meaning from the transition period Comrade Mao Tsetung spoke of at the Tenth Plenary Session of the Party’s Eighth Central Committee in September 1962 and thereafter, which denotes the entire historical period of transition from capitalism to communism.

THE YOUTH LEAGUE IN ITS WORK MUST TAKE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH INTO CONSIDERATION

June 30, 1953

The Youth League's assertion of independence from the Party is already a thing of the past. Today, the trouble with the Youth League is its lack of independent activities, not its assertion of independence.

The Youth League must co-ordinate its activities with the Party's central tasks, but in so doing it must have its own independent activities and take the characteristics of youth into consideration. In 1952, in a talk with comrades of the Central Committee of the Youth League, I raised two questions for it to think over: first, how the Party should lead the League's work, and second, how the League should do its work. Both involve consideration for the characteristics of youth. In various places the Party committees have expressed satisfaction with the Youth League because the latter has co-ordinated its work with the Party's central tasks. Now it is time to express dissatisfaction, that is, dissatisfaction with the Youth League's failure to arrange for independent activities that suit the characteristics of youth. The leading organs of the Party and the League should learn how to lead the League in its work and, in order to organize and educate the mass of young people, they should be good at co-ordinating its activities with the Party's central tasks and taking the characteristics of youth into consideration.

Under the Party's leadership, the Youth League has been active in every field of revolutionary work and has a great deal to its credit. Our revolutionary cause, whether in the factories, on the farms, in the army units or in the schools, cannot succeed without the young people.

Talk by Comrade Mao Tsetung when he received the Presidium of the Second National Congress of the New Democratic Youth League of China.

China's youth are well disciplined and they have fulfilled all the tasks assigned them by the Party. Now that the war is coming to an end in Korea and the agrarian reform is completed, the emphasis in our work at home is being switched over to socialist transformation and socialist construction. This makes study imperative. The Youth League must know how to lead the young people in making a common effort with older people to do a good job in agriculture in the countryside, in industry in the cities, in studying at school, in performing their duties in offices as well as in training in army units to turn our national defence forces into a modernized army.

Young people between fourteen and twenty-five need to study and work, but as youth is the age of physical growth, much is imperilled if their health is neglected. The young need to study much more, for they have to learn many things older people already know. However, they must not be overloaded with either study or work. And the fourteen- to eighteen-year-olds in particular should not be made to work with the same intensity as grown-ups. Young people, being what they are, need more time for play, recreation and sports. Otherwise they won't be happy. And in time they will fall in love and get married. In all this they are different from older people.

I would like to say a few words to our young people: first, I wish them good health; second, I wish them success in their study; and third, I wish them success in their work.

I would suggest that all students be given an additional hour of sleep. They are supposed to have eight hours of sleep, but actually they take only six or seven and generally feel they don't have enough. Young people at school are prone to nervous tension and so often find it hard to go to sleep and then hard to wake up. Be sure to make nine hours of sleep a rule. An order to this effect should be issued and enforced, there should be no argument about it. Let young people have enough sleep, and the teachers too.

The revolution has brought us many fine things but also one thing which is not so good. Everybody is much too active and enthusiastic, often getting tired out. Now we must make sure that everybody, including workers, peasants, soldiers, students and cadres, can keep fit. Of course, it does not necessarily mean that if you are good in health you will be good in study, for study must be done in the proper way.

At present the classes in junior middle schools take too much of the students' time, and it would be preferable if they were cut down to suitable proportions. Meetings for activists are too frequent and

should also be reduced. Study on the one hand and recreation, rest and sleep on the other should both receive adequate attention. Young workers, peasants and soldiers learn while they work, and so adequate attention should also be paid to their work and study as well as to their recreation, rest and sleep.

We should grasp the matter firmly at both ends, with study and work at one end and sleep, rest and recreation at the other. In the past, we firmly grasped one end, leaving the other end either not grasped at all or only half-heartedly so. Now it is necessary to arrange some recreation, for which there must be time and facilities, and this end should be firmly grasped too. The Party Central Committee has decided to cut down the number of meetings and study hours, and you must see to it that this decision is carried out. Challenge anyone who refuses to do so.

In short, young people should be enabled to keep fit, study well and work well. Some leading comrades are interested only in getting work out of young people and pay little attention to their health. You can quote the above to their faces. You are on firm ground, namely, you are protecting the younger generation so that it can grow sturdily. We of the older generation were deprived of our due, for adults simply didn't bother themselves about their children. Adults had a table to eat their meals at while children had to do without one. Children had no say in the family, and if they cried they were sure to get slapped. In the new China of today we must change our approach and think more in the interest of our children and youth.

Young cadres must be elected to the League Central Committee. At the time of the Three Kingdoms, Tsao Tsao led his huge army to the Yangtse River to attack the Kingdom of Wu in eastern China. Chou Yu, who was then a "Youth League member" in age, was appointed commanding general of the Wu army. Cheng Pu and other battle-seasoned generals protested but were later persuaded into accepting his command, and in the end the battle was won. Now we want the present-day "Chou Yus" to sit on the League Central Committee, and yet people won't hear of it! For the League Central Committee only older people are candidates — very few young. Will that do? Of course, we can't judge by age alone, ability also counts. Originally there were only nine people under thirty on the list of candidates for the League Central Committee, but after discussion by the Party Central Committee their number has been increased to more than sixty, and even so that makes up only a little over one-fourth. Those over

thirty still form almost three-fourths of the total, and yet some comrades complain that this number is not big enough. I think it's quite enough. Some comrades say they are not so sure whether all these sixty-odd young people are competent in every way. We should have full confidence in our young people, most of them will prove equal to their jobs. A few may prove incompetent, but there is no need to worry, they can be replaced by later elections. In this way the basic orientation will not be wrong. The young are not our inferiors. Old people have more experience, which of course is a strong point, but on the other hand their physical powers are declining, their eyesight and hearing are not so sharp as before and their limbs not so agile as those of the young. This is a law of nature. It is necessary to convince those comrades who disagree.

The Youth League organizations should give consideration to the characteristics of youth and have their own sphere of work, but at the same time they should submit to the leadership of the Party committees at the corresponding levels. This is nothing new but something of long standing and has always been a tenet of Marxism. This is to proceed from reality. After all, youth is youth, or else why bother to have a Youth League? Young people are different from adults and so are young women from young men. Disregard these characteristics and you will alienate yourselves from the masses. Now you have nine million League members, and if you neglect the characteristics of youth, probably only one million will support you and eight million will not.

In its work the Youth League must make allowance for the majority of its members and at the same time pay attention to the advanced ones. This may not satisfy some of the advanced elements, for they want the League organization to make stricter demands on the entire membership. This is not really proper, you must try to convince them. The draft constitution of the League lays down far too many obligations and too few rights; there should be some leeway so that the majority can keep in step. You should focus your attention on the many and not just on the few.

It is stipulated in your draft constitution that a member will be considered to have automatically withdrawn from the League if he fails to take part in its regular cell meetings for four months; this is much too severe. Even the Party Constitution allows six months, can't you do the same? Don't put into the League constitution what is impossible to carry out or what is possible for only one million members, not for the other eight million. There must be flexibility in applying principles. There is a gap between what ought to be and what actually is. It takes

years for some laws to be fully carried out. For instance, many of the articles in the Marriage Law are programmatic and their thorough implementation will take at least a period of three five-year plans. The article "don't gossip behind people's back", while correct in principle, need not be put into the League constitution. To combat liberalism is a long-term task, and it exists even in the Party to no small extent. You may prohibit backbiting, but actually it won't work. Don't impose too narrow limits. The essential thing is to make a clear distinction between ourselves and the enemy.

Prestige is built up gradually. There was a time when some people in the army made up ditties to abuse others. We imposed no ban nor made any investigation, yet our army was not wrecked. We had a firm grip on a few major things only, such as the Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points for Attention, and our armed forces were steadily led onto the correct path. The true admiration the masses feel for their leaders derives from what they come to know of them in the course of revolutionary practice. Trust comes out of real understanding. Now the League Central Committee already enjoys a fairly high prestige. Although some people do not yet admire it, they will in the course of time. When a young man first takes office and is not rated high, there is no need to worry, for it is only to be expected that there will be some criticism and abuse. "Whispers" exist for lack of "an open outlet for views". If there is full democracy and you allow others to touch you on the raw in face-to-face encounters, then even if you want people to go on whispering, they will say they have no time for that now and want to call it a day. Nevertheless, problems will always crop up, and don't imagine that they can be solved once and for all; there are problems today and there will be problems tomorrow.

The Party's general task for the transition period is basically to accomplish socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce in the course of three five-year plans. Three five-year plans cover a period of fifteen years. Make a small step each year and a big stride every five years, and with three big strides the work is almost done. "Basically accomplished" does not mean "completely accomplished". To say it is basically accomplished is a prudent way of speaking; it is always better to be prudent in everything we do.

At this stage China's agricultural economy is by and large individual in nature, and it needs step-by-step socialist transformation.

The principle of voluntary participation must be adhered to in promoting the mutual-aid and co-operative movement in agriculture. Failure to promote it will lead to the capitalist road, and that will be a Right deviation. To push it too hard won't do either, for that will be a "Left" deviation. The movement must proceed step by step after due preparation. We are always against fighting a battle without being prepared and being sure of victory, or fighting a battle when prepared but not sure of victory. In the days when we fought Chiang Kai-shek, some people erred on the side of subjectivism at the outset, but later when this subjectivism was overcome through rectification, we emerged the victors. We are now engaged in the battle for socialism, fighting to accomplish socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. This is the general task set for the whole nation. As to how the Youth League is to carry out this general task, you should lay down appropriate guidelines in the light of the characteristics of youth.

ON STATE CAPITALISM

July 9, 1953

The present-day capitalist economy in China is a capitalist economy which for the most part is under the control of the People's Government and which is linked with the state-owned socialist economy in various forms and supervised by the workers. It is not an ordinary but a particular kind of capitalist economy, namely, a state-capitalist economy of a new type. It exists not chiefly to make profits for the capitalists but to meet the needs of the people and the state. True, a share of the profits produced by the workers goes to the capitalists, but that is only a small part, about one quarter, of the total. The remaining three quarters are produced for the workers (in the form of the welfare fund), for the state (in the form of income tax) and for expanding productive capacity (a small part of which produces profits for the capitalists). Therefore, this state-capitalist economy of a new type takes on a socialist character to a very great extent and benefits the workers and the state.

Written comment on a document of the National Conference on Financial and Economic Work held in the summer of 1953.

THE PARTY'S GENERAL LINE FOR THE TRANSITION PERIOD

August 1953

The time between the founding of the People's Republic of China and the basic completion of socialist transformation is a period of transition. The Party's general line or general task for the transition period is basically to accomplish the country's industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce over a fairly long period of time. This general line should be the beacon illuminating all our work, and wherever we deviate from it, we shall make Right or "Left" mistakes.

Many policies under this general line were already set forth and decided upon in principle in the resolution adopted at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee held in March 1949. Nevertheless, many comrades were not inclined to work in accordance with the decisions of the Second Plenary Session and on some matters preferred to go their own way contrary to the session's decisions or even openly violated its principles.

Important directive written by Comrade Mao Tsetung when he went over the summing-up to be made by Comrade Chou En-lai at the National Conference on Financial and Economic Work held in the summer of 1953.

COMBAT BOURGEOIS IDEAS IN THE PARTY

August 12, 1953

Our conference has been a success, and Premier Chou has made a fine summing-up.

It is now clear that since the movements against the “three evils” and the “five evils” two kinds of mistake which are different in nature have been found in the Party. One kind is of an ordinary nature, for instance, the “five excesses”, mistakes which anyone can make and which may crop up at any time; the “five excesses” may also turn into the “five deficiencies”. The other kind is mistakes of principle, such as the tendency towards capitalism. This kind is a reflection of bourgeois ideas within the Party and a matter of stand that is contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

The movements against the “three evils” and the “five evils” dealt heavy blows to bourgeois ideas inside the Party. But at the time only bourgeois ideas related to corruption and waste got a good thrashing, while those manifesting themselves in questions concerning the Party line were not dealt with. The latter are to be found not only in our financial and economic work but also in political and judicial, cultural and educational and other fields, and among comrades in the localities as well as at the national level.

Mistakes in our financial and economic work have been severely criticized ever since last December when Comrade Po I-po came out with his new tax system entailing “equality between public and private enterprises”¹ and also at the present conference. That system, if allowed to develop, would have led inevitably to capitalism, in contravention of Marxism-Leninism and the Party’s general line for the transition period.

¹ Speech at the National Conference on Financial and Economic Work held in the summer of 1953.

What will the transition period lead to, socialism or capitalism? The Party's general line prescribes transition to socialism. This requires a period of struggle of considerable length. Unlike that of Chang Tzu-shan,² the mistake made in the new tax system involves a question of ideology and a departure from the Party's general line. We must unfold a struggle in the Party against bourgeois ideas. Ideologically, the Party membership falls into three categories: some comrades are firm and unwavering and are Marxist-Leninist in their thinking; quite a number are essentially Marxist-Leninist but infected with non-Marxist-Leninist ideas; and a small number are no good, their thinking is non-Marxist-Leninist. In criticizing Po I-po's erroneous ideas, some say his mistake stems from petty-bourgeois individualism; that's not quite right. He should be criticized mainly for his bourgeois ideas, which are favourable to capitalism and harmful to socialism. Only such criticism is correct. "Left" opportunist mistakes, as we said before, are a reflection of petty-bourgeois fanaticism within the Party; they occurred in times when we broke with the bourgeoisie. On the three occasions when we have co-operated with the bourgeoisie, namely, in the first period of co-operation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, in the period of the War of Resistance Against Japan and in the present period, it has been bourgeois ideology that has influenced a number of people in the Party, and they have vacillated. That was how Po I-po came to make his mistake.

Po I-po's mistake is not an isolated case. Such mistakes are found not only at the national level but also at those of the greater administrative areas and the provinces and municipalities. Each greater administrative area, each province and municipality, should call a meeting to review its work in the light of the resolution of the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee and of the summing-up of the present conference, so as to educate the cadres.

Recently I made a trip to Wuhan and Nanking and learned a lot, which was very helpful. Practically nothing comes to my ear in Peking, and therefore I shall go on tour from time to time. The central leading organ is a factory which turns out ideas as its products. If it does not know what is going on at the lower levels, gets no raw material or has no semi-processed products to work on, how can it turn out any products? Sometimes finished products are turned out by the localities, and the central leading organ need only popularize them throughout the country. For instance, take the movements against the old and new "three evils".³ Both were initiated in the localities. The

departments under the central authorities issue directives arbitrarily. The products from these departments ought to be top grade, but actually they are inferior in quality and there are large numbers of completely worthless rejects. Leading organs in the greater administrative areas and the provinces and municipalities are local factories for turning out ideas, and their products should be top grade too.

Po I-po's mistake is a manifestation of bourgeois ideas. It benefits capitalism and harms socialism and semi-socialism and runs counter to the resolution of the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee.

On whom should we rely? On the working class, or on the bourgeoisie? The resolution of the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee made it clear long ago: "We must wholeheartedly rely on the working class." The resolution also says that in the rehabilitation and development of production the following must be the rule: the production of state industry comes first, that of private industry second and handicraft production third. The emphasis is on industry, and first of all on heavy industry, which is owned by the state. Of the five sectors of our present-day economy, the state-owned economy is the leading sector. Capitalist industry and commerce must be gradually guided towards state capitalism.

The resolution of the Second Plenary Session says that the livelihood of the workers and other working people is to improve on the basis of increased production. People with bourgeois ideas pay no attention to this point, and Po I-po is typical in this respect. We must lay emphasis on the development of production, but consideration must be given to both the development of production and the improvement of the people's livelihood. Something must be done for their material well-being, but neither too much nor nothing at all. At present there are quite a few cadres who ignore the people's livelihood and couldn't care less about their sufferings. There was a regiment in Kweichow Province which occupied large tracts of peasant farmland. That was a serious encroachment on the people's interests. It is wrong to ignore the people's livelihood, but the emphasis must be laid on production and construction.

The question of utilizing, restricting and transforming the capitalist sector of the economy was also made quite clear at the Second Plenary Session. The resolution it adopted says that the private capitalist economy must not be allowed to expand uncurbed but should be restricted from several directions — in the scope of its operations, by

tax policy and by market prices and working conditions. The relationship of the socialist economy to the capitalist economy is that of the leader to the led. Restriction versus opposition to restriction is the main form of class struggle in the new-democratic state. Now the new tax system talks about "equality between public and private enterprises"; that is at variance with the line which makes the state-owned economy the leading sector.

As for the co-operative transformation of individual farming and handicrafts, the resolution of the Second Plenary Session puts it clearly:

Such co-operatives are collective economic organizations of the working people, based on private ownership and under the direction of the state power led by the proletariat. The fact that the Chinese people are culturally backward and have no tradition in organizing co-operatives makes it quite difficult for us to promote and develop the co-operative movement, but co-operatives can and must be organized and they must be promoted and developed. If we had only a state-owned economy and no co-operative economy, it would be impossible for us to lead the individual economy of the working people step by step towards collectivization, impossible to develop from the new-democratic state to the socialist state of the future and impossible to consolidate the leadership of the proletariat in the state power.

This resolution was adopted in March 1949, but quite a few comrades have failed to take note of it and what is no longer news strikes them as novel. In his article "Strengthen the Party's Political Work in the Rural Areas", Po I-po said that the individual peasants' road to collectivization through mutual aid and co-operation "is sheer fantasy because the present mutual-aid teams, based as they are on the individual economy, cannot develop gradually into collective farms, still less can such a road lead to the collectivization of agriculture as a whole". This runs counter to the Party's resolution.

There are now two united fronts, two alliances. One is the alliance of the working class and the peasants; this is the foundation. The other is the alliance of the working class and the national bourgeoisie. As the peasants are labourers and not exploiters, the alliance of the working class and the peasants is a long-term one. Nevertheless, there are contradictions between the working class and the peasants. We should guide the peasants step by step from individual ownership to collec-

tive ownership in accordance with the voluntary principle. In the future there will also be contradictions, between state ownership and collective ownership. These contradictions are all non-antagonistic. On the other hand, the contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie are antagonistic.

The bourgeoisie is sure to corrode people and aim its sugar-coated bullets at them. Its sugar-coated bullets are of two kinds, material and spiritual. A spiritual one hit its target, Po I-po. He made his mistake because he succumbed to the influence of bourgeois ideas. The editorial preaching the new tax system was applauded by the bourgeoisie, and Po I-po was pleased. Before the new tax system was initiated, he solicited suggestions from the bourgeoisie and reached a gentleman's agreement with them, but he failed to report to the Central Committee. The Ministry of Commerce and the Federation of Supply and Marketing Co-operatives objected at the time, and the Ministry of Light Industry was dissatisfied too. Of the 1,100,000 cadres and employees working in the financial, economic and trade fields, the overwhelming majority are good and only a small number are not. Those who are not fall into two categories: counter-revolutionaries, who should be weeded out; and revolutionaries, including Party members and non-Party personnel, who have made mistakes and who should therefore be remoulded through criticism and education.

To ensure the triumph of the cause of socialism, we must combat erroneous Right opportunist tendencies, that is, bourgeois ideas, throughout the Party, and first of all in the leading bodies of the Party, government, army and mass organizations at the national level and at those of the greater administrative areas and the provinces and municipalities. The greater administrative areas and the provinces and municipalities should call meetings in due time with the participation of secretaries of prefectural Party committees and commissioners of prefectures⁴ to unfold criticism and discussion and to clarify the question of the socialist road versus the capitalist road.

To ensure the triumph of the cause of socialism, we must exercise collective leadership and oppose decentralism and subjectivism.

At present we must combat subjectivism, not only in the form of rash advance but also in the form of conservatism. In the days of the new-democratic revolution both Right and "Left" subjectivist mistakes occurred. Chen Tu-hsiu and Chang Kuo-tao made Right mistakes and Wang Ming first "Left" mistakes and then Right ones. The rectification movement in Yen-an concentrated its efforts on combating

dogmatism and opposed empiricism in passing. Both dogmatism and empiricism are forms of subjectivism. No revolution can triumph unless theory is integrated with practice. The problem was solved in that rectification movement. We were right in adopting the policy of learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient. This time the unrelenting and thorough-going criticism of Po I-po is designed to help those who have erred correct their mistakes and to ensure the victorious advance of socialism. In the present period of the socialist revolution subjectivism is still in evidence. Rash advance and conservatism both disregard the actual state of affairs, both are subjectivist. The revolution and construction cannot succeed unless subjectivism is overcome. In the days of the democratic revolution rectification served to correct the error of subjectivism and in consequence the whole Party was united, including both the comrades who had adhered to the correct line and those who had made mistakes. From Yen-an they set out for different war theatres, and the whole Party, pulling its weight as one man, went on to win nation-wide victory. Today, the cadres are more mature and their political level is higher, and it is hoped that it will not take long for them basically to overcome subjectivism in their task of leadership and bring the subjective into correspondence with the objective through their efforts.

The solution of all these problems hinges on strengthening collective leadership and opposing decentralism. We have all along opposed decentralism. The directive issued by the Central Committee to its bureaus and the army commanders on February 2, 1941 stipulated that all circular telegrams, declarations and inner-Party directives bearing on the country as a whole must have the prior approval of the Central Committee. In May, the Central Committee issued a directive calling for unified external propaganda by the various base areas. On July 1 of the same year, on the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Party, the Central Committee issued its decision on strengthening Party spirit with the emphasis on combating decentralism. In 1948 the Central Committee issued more directives to the same effect. It issued a directive on setting up a system of reports on January 7 and a supplementary directive in March. The Political Bureau met in September and adopted a resolution on rules governing reports to and requests for instructions from the Central Committee. On September 20, the Central Committee made a decision on strengthening the Party committee system. On March 10, 1953 the Central Committee adopted

a decision on strengthening its leadership over the work of the government in order to avert the danger of government departments drifting away from its leadership.

Centralization and decentralization are in constant contradiction with each other. Decentralism has grown since we moved into the cities. To resolve this contradiction all the principal and important issues must first be discussed and decided on by the Party committee before its decisions are referred to the government for implementation. For instance, such important decisions as the erection of the Monument to the Heroes of the People in Tien An Men Square and the demolition of Peking's city walls were made by the Central Committee and carried out by the government. Matters of secondary importance can be left to the leading Party groups in government departments. It just won't do for the Central Committee to monopolize everything. Combating decentralism will win maximum popular approval because most comrades in the Party care about collective leadership. Party members fall into three categories in their attitude towards collective leadership. Those in the first category care about collective leadership. Those in the second do not care so much, maintaining that the Party committees had better leave them alone, but they don't mind being supervised. "Better leave me alone" reveals a lack of Party spirit, while "don't mind being supervised" shows some measure of Party spirit. We must seize on this "don't mind being supervised" and help such comrades by education and persuasion to overcome their lack of Party spirit. Otherwise, each ministry would go its own way and the Central Committee could not supervise the ministries, the ministers could not supervise the department and bureau heads, and the division heads could not supervise the section chiefs — no one, in short, could supervise anyone. In consequence, independent kingdoms would proliferate and hundreds of feudal princes would emerge. Those in the third category are only a handful. They flatly reject collective leadership and always prefer to be left alone. The decision on strengthening Party spirit puts the stress on the strict observance of discipline under democratic centralism, in other words, the minority is subordinate to the majority, the individual to the organization, the lower level to the higher level and the entire Party to the Central Committee (a case of subordinating the majority to the minority, as this minority represents the majority). Opinions are welcome, but to undermine Party unity would be a most shameful thing. It is reliance on the political experience and wisdom of the

collective that can guarantee the correct leadership of the Party and the state and the unshakable unity of the ranks of the Party.

At this conference Liu Shao-chi said he had made mistakes of a sort, and Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping said he too had made some mistakes. Whoever makes a mistake must make a self-criticism, and everybody without exception must put himself under the Party's supervision and the leadership of Party committees at various levels. This is a prime requirement for fulfilling the Party's tasks. Throughout the country there are quite a number of people who thrive on anarchy, and Po I-po is one such person. To some extent he has been corrupted both politically and ideologically and it is absolutely necessary to criticize him.

One final point. We must foster modesty, willingness to learn and perseverance.

We must have perseverance. In the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, for instance, we hit U.S. imperialism where it hurt and struck fear into its heart. This was an asset, an important factor, in our country's construction. What was of the utmost importance was that our armed forces were thus steeled, the fighters displaying valour and the commanders resourcefulness. True, we suffered casualties and incurred a cost; we paid a price. But we had absolutely no fear of sacrifice; once we set our mind on doing something, we saw it through. When Hu Tsung-nan attacked the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region, we did not pull out although we had only one county seat left, and we thought nothing of it when we had to live on the leaves of the trees. This is the kind of fortitude we must have.

We must study and must not become conceited or look down on others. Goose eggs don't think much of chicken eggs and the ferrous metals don't think much of rare metals — such a disdainful attitude is not scientific. Although China is a big country and ours is a big Party, there is no reason to look down on small countries or small parties. We must always be ready to learn from the people of fraternal countries and maintain a genuine internationalist spirit. In our foreign trade some people are arrogant and overweening, and this is wrong. Education must be conducted in the whole Party, and particularly among people working abroad. We must study hard and work hard so as basically to accomplish socialist industrialization and socialist transformation in fifteen years or a little longer. By then our country will have become strong, yet we should still be modest and should always be ready to learn.

There are several regulations which were adopted at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee but not written into its resolution. The first is a ban on birthday celebrations. Birthday celebrations don't beget longevity. The important thing is to do our work well. The second is a ban on gifts, at least in the Party. The third is to keep toasts to a minimum. Toasts may be allowed on certain occasions. The fourth is to keep applause to a minimum. There should be no ban and no pouring of cold water on the masses who applaud out of enthusiasm. The fifth is a ban on naming places after persons. The sixth is a ban on placing Chinese comrades on a par with Marx, Engels, Lenin or Stalin. Our relationship to them is one of pupils to teachers and that is how it should be. Observance of these regulations is true modesty.

In short, we must remain modest, be willing to learn, retain our perseverance and adhere to the system of collective leadership so as to achieve socialist transformation and attain victory for socialism.

NOTES

¹ This new tax system was introduced in December 1952 and put into effect in January 1953. Though nominally entailing "equality between public and private enterprises", in reality it lightened the tax burdens on private industrial and commercial enterprises and increased those on state and co-operative enterprises, thus serving the interests of the capitalists at the expense of the latter. Soon after Comrade Mao Tsetung made his criticism, this error was corrected.

² Chang Tzu-shan was at one time secretary of the Tientsin Prefectural Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. Corroded by the bourgeoisie, he degenerated and became a big embezzler and was sentenced to death during the movement against the "three evils".

³ The movement against the old "three evils" was the struggle launched in 1951 against corruption, waste and bureaucracy. The movement against the new "three evils" was the struggle launched in 1953 against bureaucracy, commandism and violations of the law and of discipline.

⁴ These commissioners were the administrative heads of the commissioners' offices, which were agencies of the provincial and autonomous region people's councils and had jurisdiction over several counties.

THE ONLY ROAD FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF CAPITALIST INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

September 7, 1953

The transformation of capitalism into socialism is to be accomplished through state capitalism.

1. In the last three years or so we have done some work on this, but as we were otherwise occupied, we didn't exert ourselves enough. From now on we should make a bigger effort.

2. With more than three years of experience behind us, we can say with certainty that accomplishing the socialist transformation of private industry and commerce by means of state capitalism is a relatively sound policy and method.

3. The policy laid down in Article 31 of the Common Programme¹ should now be clearly understood and concretely applied step by step. "Clearly understood" means that people in positions of leadership at the central and local levels should first of all have the firm conviction that state capitalism is the only road for the transformation of capitalist industry and commerce and for the gradual completion of the transition to socialism. So far this has not been the case either with members of the Communist Party or with democratic personages. The present meeting² is being held to achieve that end.

4. Make steady progress and avoid being too hasty. It will take at least three to five years to lead the country's private industry and commerce basically onto the path of state capitalism, so there should be no cause for alarm or uneasiness.

5. Joint state-private management; orders placed by the state with private enterprises to process materials or manufacture goods, with the state providing all the raw materials and taking all the finished products; and similarly placed orders, with the state taking not all but

¹Outline for a talk to representative personages from the democratic parties and industrial and commercial circles on September 7, 1953.

most of the finished products — these are the three forms of state capitalism to be adopted in the case of private industry.

6. State capitalism can also be applied in the case of private commerce, which cannot possibly be dismissed by “excluding it”. Here our experience is limited and further study is needed.

7. With approximately 3,800,000 workers and shop assistants, private industry and commerce are a big asset to the state and play a large part in the nation’s economy and the people’s livelihood. Not only do they provide the state with goods, but they can also accumulate capital and train cadres for the state.

8. Some capitalists keep themselves at a great distance from the state and have not changed their profits-before-everything mentality. Some workers are advancing too fast and won’t allow the capitalists to make any profit at all. We should try to educate these workers and capitalists and help them gradually (but the sooner the better) adapt themselves to our state policy, namely, to make China’s private industry and commerce mainly serve the nation’s economy and the people’s livelihood and partly earn profits for the capitalists and in this way embark on the path of state capitalism.

The following table shows the distribution of profits in state-capitalist enterprises:

Income Tax	34.5%
Welfare fund	15.0%
Accumulation fund	30.0%
Dividends to capitalists	20.5%
<hr/>	
Total	100.0%

9. It is necessary to go on educating the capitalists in patriotism, and to this end we should systematically cultivate a number of them who have a broader vision and are ready to lean towards the Communist Party and the People’s Government, so that most of the other capitalists may be convinced through them.

10. Not only must the implementation of state capitalism be based on what is necessary and feasible (see the Common Programme), but it must also be voluntary on the part of the capitalists, because it is a co-operative undertaking and co-operation admits of no coercion. This is different from the way we dealt with the landlords.

II. Considerable progress has been made in the last few years by the various nationalities, democratic classes, democratic parties and

people's organizations, and still greater progress will, in my opinion, be made in the next three to five years. So it is possible basically to accomplish the task of leading private industry and commerce onto the path of state capitalism in three to five years. The preponderance of state enterprises affords the material guarantee for the fulfilment of this task.

12. As for the completion of the task for the entire transition period, which consists of the basic accomplishment of the country's industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce, this cannot be done in three to five years, but will instead take a period of several five-year plans. On this question it is necessary to oppose both the idea of leaving things to the indefinite future and the idea of rushing things through.

13. One is the leader while the other is the led; one seeks no private profit while the other still seeks a certain amount of private profit, and so on and so forth; that's where the differences lie. But under our present conditions, private industry and commerce in the main serve the nation's economy and the people's livelihood (which, as far as the distribution of profits is concerned, take roughly three-fourths of the total). Therefore we can and should persuade the workers in private enterprises to act in the same way as those in state enterprises, namely, to increase production and practise economy emulate one another in labour, raise labour productivity, reduce costs of production and raise both quantity and quality, thus serving the interest of both the state sector and the private sector and that of labour and capital.

NOTES

¹ Article 31 of the Common Programme stipulates: "Enterprises jointly operated by state and private capital are enterprises of a state-capitalist character. Whenever necessary and feasible, private capital shall be encouraged to develop in the direction of state capitalism by such means as undertaking processing work for state enterprises, operating enterprises jointly with the state, or, in the form of concessions, operating state enterprises and exploiting national resources, etc."

² This refers to the forty-ninth meeting (enlarged) of the Standing Committee of the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference, September 8-11, 1953.

OUR GREAT VICTORY IN THE WAR TO RESIST U.S. AGGRESSION AND AID KOREA AND OUR FUTURE TASKS

September 12, 1953

After three years we have won a great victory in the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea. It has now come to a halt.

To what was this victory due? Just now fellow members put it down to correct leadership. Leadership is one factor; nothing can succeed without correct leadership. But we won mainly because ours was a people's war, the whole nation gave it support and the people of China and Korea fought shoulder to shoulder.

We fought U.S. imperialism, an enemy wielding weapons many times superior to ours, and yet we were able to win and compelled it to agree to a truce. Why was the truce possible?

First, militarily the U.S. aggressors were in an unfavourable position and were on the receiving end. If they had not accepted the truce, their whole battle line would have been broken through and Seoul would have fallen into the hands of the Korean people. This situation became evident in the summer of last year.

Each belligerent calls his own battle line a bastion of iron. Ours is truly a bastion of iron. Our soldiers and cadres are resourceful and brave and dare to look death in the face. In contrast the U.S. aggressor troops are afraid of death, and their officers are rather rigid, not very flexible. Their battle line is not solid and is anything but a bastion of iron.

The problems facing our side were first whether we could fight, then whether we could hold our lines, later whether we could ensure the flow of supplies, and finally whether we could foil the germ warfare. These four problems came one after the other and were all

Speech at the twenty-fourth Session of the Central People's Government Council.

solved. Our troops grew from strength to strength in fighting. This summer, we were already able to break through an enemy position with its front of twenty-one kilometres within an hour, fire several hundred thousand shells in a concentrated attack and penetrate the enemy area up to eighteen kilometres. If we had kept this up and mounted two, three or four more attacks, his whole battle line would have been cut to pieces.

Second, politically the enemy had many insoluble internal contradictions, and the people the world over demanded peace.

Third, economically the enemy spent vast sums in the war of aggression against Korea, and his budgetary revenues and expenditures were not balanced.

All these causes combined to force the enemy to come to terms. The first was the primary cause, and in its absence a truce with the enemy would have been difficult. The U.S. imperialists are very arrogant; if at all possible, they always refuse to talk reason, and will do so after a fashion only when driven into a tight corner.

In the Korean war the enemy suffered 1,090,000 in killed and wounded. Naturally we paid a price too. Nevertheless, our casualties were far fewer than anticipated and they became still fewer after tunnels were built. We grew stronger and stronger through fighting. The Americans failed to undermine our positions; on the contrary, their units were always wiped out by us.

Just now you all mentioned the factor of leadership. In my view, leadership is one factor, but the most important factor is the contribution of ideas by the masses. Our cadres and soldiers thought up all sorts of ways to fight the enemy. Let me give one example. In the first month of the war our losses in trucks were tremendous. What was to be done? While the leadership devised counter-measures, we relied mainly on the masses to come up with ideas. Over ten thousand people were posted on both sides of the highway to fire signal shots to warn of approaching enemy planes. On hearing these signals, our drivers would dodge or find places in which to hide their trucks. In the meantime the roads were widened and many new ones built so that trucks could run in both directions unimpeded. Thus the losses in trucks dropped from 40 per cent at the beginning to less than 1 per cent. Later on, underground storehouses and even underground auditoriums were built. While enemy bombs fell from overhead, we went on with our meetings underground. When they picture the Korean battlefield, people living in Peking feel it must have been very dangerous. True,

there was danger, but it was not so terrible as long as everyone contributed ideas.

Our experience is that reliance on the people together with a fairly correct leadership enables us to defeat a better-equipped enemy with our inferior equipment.

The victory in the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea is a great one and has major significance.

First, together with the Korean people we have fought our way back to the 38th Parallel and held on there. This is very important. If we had not fought back to the 38th Parallel and our front lines had remained along the Yalu and Tumen Rivers, it would have been impossible for the people in Shenyang, Anshan and Fushun to carry on production free from worry.

Second, we have gained military experience. The ground, air and naval forces, the infantry, artillery, engineer, tank, railway, air defence and signal corps and also the medical and logistic units, etc. of the Chinese People's Volunteers have all gained practical experience in fighting the U.S. aggressor troops. This time we have taken the measure of the U.S. armed forces. If you have never taken them on, you are liable to be scared of them. We have fought them for thirty-three months and got to know them for what they are worth. U.S. imperialism is not terrifying, nothing to make a fuss about. Such is our experience, indeed an invaluable piece of experience.

Third, the people of the whole country have heightened their political awareness.

From the above three points a fourth can be deduced: a new imperialist war of aggression against China and a third world war have been put off.

The imperialist aggressors ought to bear this in mind: the Chinese people are now organized, they are not to be trifled with. Once they are provoked to anger, things can get very tough.

The enemy may resume the war, and even if he doesn't, he is sure to make trouble in all sorts of ways, such as by sending in secret agents to carry out wrecking activities. He has set up a vast network of secret services in places like Taiwan, Hongkong and Japan. But we have gained experience in the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, and so long as we mobilize the masses and rely on the people, we know how to cope with the enemy.

For us the present situation is different from that in the winter of 1950. Were the U.S. aggressors then on the other side of the 38th

Parallel? No, they were not. They were on the other side of the Yalu and Tumen Rivers. Did we then have any experience in fighting the U.S. aggressors? No, we did not. Did we then know much about the U.S. troops? No, we did not. Now, all this has changed. Supposing U.S. imperialism does not put off its new war of aggression and says: "I'll fight!", then we can cope with it by relying on the first three points. But supposing it says: "I'll not fight!", then the fourth point will hold good. Here is proof of the superiority of our people's democratic dictatorship.

Are we going to invade others? No, we will invade no one anywhere. But if others invade us, we will fight back and fight to a finish.

The Chinese people adhere to this stand: we are for peace, but are not afraid of war; we are ready for both. We have the support of the people. In the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, people fell over each other to join up. The conditions for enrolment were stiff, only one in a hundred was chosen. People said the conditions were stricter than those for choosing a husband for one's daughter. If U.S. imperialism wants to resume the fighting, we will take it on again.

War costs money. Yet the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea did not cost us too much. It went on for several years, but the expenses incurred were less than a single year's industrial and commercial taxes. Of course, it would have been better if we had not had to fight the war and spend this money. For construction in the country today calls for expenditure and the peasants still have difficulties. Last year and the year before last, the agricultural tax was a shade on the heavy side, and so this set some friends talking. They demanded a "policy of benevolence", as if they represented the interests of the peasants. Did we favour this view? No, we didn't. At that time we had to do our utmost to win victory in the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea. For the peasants, for the people of the whole country, which was in their interest? To endure austerity for the time being and strive for victory? Or not to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea and so save a few coppers? Undoubtedly winning the war was in their interest. It was because the war required money that we collected a bit more in agricultural tax last year and the year before. This year it is different. We have not increased the agricultural tax and have put a ceiling on its volume.

Speaking of the "policy of benevolence", we are of course for it. But what was the policy of maximum benevolence? To resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea. To carry out this policy of maximum

benevolence sacrifices had to be made, money spent and more collected in agricultural tax. Just because more was collected, some people raised an outcry. They even claimed to represent the interests of the peasants. I just don't approve of such talk.

To resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea was to implement the policy of benevolence, and to carry on industrial construction today is likewise to implement this policy.

Policies of benevolence are of two kinds. One is concerned with the people's immediate interests. The other is concerned with their long-term interests, such as resisting U.S. aggression and aiding Korea and building heavy industry. The first is a policy of lesser benevolence and the second a policy of greater benevolence. Both must be taken into consideration and it is wrong not to do so. Where then is the emphasis to be placed? On the policy of greater benevolence. At present the emphasis in our policy of benevolence should be on the construction of heavy industry. Construction takes money. Therefore, much as the livelihood of the people needs to be improved, this cannot be done to any great extent for the time being. In other words, while we have to improve the people's livelihood, we must not try to do too much, and while we have to make some allowance for it, we must not make too much. To make allowance for the policy of lesser benevolence at the expense of the policy of greater benevolence is to go off the right track.

Now some friends put lop-sided stress on the policy of lesser benevolence; in effect, they wanted us to give up the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, and now they want us to give up the building of heavy industry. We must criticize this erroneous view. It is also to be found in the Communist Party; we came across it in Yen-an. In 1941 we collected 200,000 piculs¹ of grain in the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region, and some people began to yell that the Communist Party was not being considerate of the peasants. A few leading cadres in the Party also brought up this issue of the policy of benevolence. I criticized this view even then. What was the policy of maximum benevolence at that time? To overthrow Japanese imperialism. If we had slashed the amount of grain to be collected from the peasants, we would have had to cut down the size of the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies. That would have been to the advantage of Japanese imperialism. So those who held this view were actually speaking on behalf of Japanese imperialism and doing it a service.

Now the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea has come to a halt. If the United States wants to resume the war, we will fight on. In that case, we will have to collect grain from the peasants, do work on them and persuade them to make their contribution. To act thus would be truly to serve the interests of the peasants. To raise outcries would actually be to serve the interests of U.S. imperialism.

There are major as well as minor principles. The people's standard of living in the whole country should be raised yearly, but not too much. If it had been raised too much, we could not have fought the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, or at least not in such grim earnest. We have fought this war resolutely and earnestly and with all our might. Whatever was available at home the Korean front could have for the asking. That has been the case for the last few years.

NOTES

¹ The picul, a weight for grain, was 150kg. in the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region, but the standard varied in different places.

CRITICISM OF LIANG SHU-MING'S REACTIONARY IDEAS

September 16-18, 1953

1. Is Mr. Liang Shu-ming a “man of integrity”? What part did he play during the peace negotiations?

Mr. Liang styles himself a “man of integrity”, the reactionary press in Hongkong describes Mr. Liang as “one man of the highest integrity” on the mainland, and Taiwan’s broadcasts go all out to puff you up, too. Do you really have “integrity”? If you do, then make a clean breast of your past history — how you opposed the Communist Party and the people, how you assassinated people with your pen, and what sort of relations you had with Han Fu-chu, Chang Tung-sun, Chen Li-fu and Chang Chun. You have had them all as close friends. I just don’t have that many friends. They were so pleased with you, addressing you as Mister while maligning me as a “bandit”. I wonder which party, which faction, you are with! I am not alone, many others have the same suspicions.

From the speech Premier Chou has just made, everybody can see that during our two peace negotiations with the Kuomintang Mr. Liang’s position was one of backing Chiang Kai-shek to the hilt at critical junctures. Chiang Kai-shek was only shamming when he agreed to hold peace negotiations. With us here today there are representatives who came to Peking for the peace negotiations and they all know whether Chiang Kai-shek was really for peace or not.

To tell the truth, Chiang Kai-shek is an assassin with a gun and Liang Shu-ming an assassin with a pen. There are two ways of killing people: one is to kill with the gun and the other with the pen. The

Essential parts of Comrade Mao Tsetung’s criticism of Liang Shu-ming at the Twenty-seventh Session of the Central People’s Government Council held in Peking. September 16-18, 1953. Members of the National Committee of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference who were in Peking at the time sat in on the session.

way which is most artfully disguised and draws no blood is to kill with the pen. That is the kind of murderer you are.

Liang Shu-ming is utterly reactionary, yet he flatly denies it, he says he is a paragon. He is not like Mr. Fu Tso-yi. Mr. Fu openly admits that he was utterly reactionary, yet he did a service to the people in the peaceful liberation of Peking. What service did you do, Liang Shu-ming? In all your life what service have you ever done to the people? Not the slightest, not the least bit. Nevertheless, you describe yourself as an incomparable beauty, outshining Hsi Shih and Wang Chao Chun and rivalling Yang Kuei Fei.

2. Liang Shu-ming has used the expression “the ninth heaven and the ninth hell”, alleging that “the workers are up in the ninth heaven whereas the peasants are down in the ninth hell” and that “the workers have the trade unions to fall back on whereas the peasant associations cannot be counted on, nor can the Party, the Youth League, the Women’s Federation, and so on; they are all below standard qualitatively and quantitatively and even inferior to the Federation of Industry and Commerce — hence no confidence”. Can this be called “support for the general line”? No! It is an *out-and-out reactionary conception*, every bit of it, it is a reactionary proposition, not a rational one. Can the People’s Government accept this kind of proposition? I don’t think it can.

3. Mr. Liang asks “to be given more information about the plans”. I am against this too. On the contrary, we shouldn’t let a man like Mr. Liang know much about our confidential matters, the less he knows the better.

Liang Shu-ming is not a man to be trusted. We can let others have more confidential information, but not you. When somewhat restricted meetings of the democratic parties are held, Liang Shu-ming, there is no need for you to attend either.

4. Mr. Liang also asks us not to put him in the non-progressive category and says he belongs to the progressive category. What should we do about it? I think we should be cautious and not make any promise offhand. Otherwise we shall be duped.

5. Mr. Liang paints a very beautiful picture of himself, claiming that several decades ago he already cherished a grand dream for building up our country with a plan which, according to him, came *very close* to New Democracy or socialism.

Is he really so beautiful? Hardly. I know him rather well, and we never met without my having to criticize his erroneous ideas. I once

told him to his face, "I never believe in your stuff." To all his talk, such as that "China is without classes", "China's problem is one of cultural maladjustment", it needs "a colourless, transparent government"¹ and "the Chinese revolution has no internal but only external causes", one must now add his brilliant talk about "the ninth heaven and the ninth hell" and about "the Communist Party having abandoned the peasants", "the Communist Party not being as reliable as the Federation of Industry and Commerce", and so on and so forth. Can I believe all this? No! I told him, China's characteristic is that it is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Since you don't admit this, you are helping imperialism and feudalism. Therefore, nobody believes in your stuff. The people believe in the Communist Party. Nobody reads your books or listens to you except reactionaries and some muddleheads. Besides, it seems Mr. Liang is not opposed to Chiang Kai-shek either. Now I can leave it to you to go into the question of whether he has ever publicly opposed Chiang Kai-shek and his reactionary Kuomintang, since I haven't read all he has written or heard all he has said.

Is such a man entitled to request a people's state to allow him access to more of its plans and confidential matters? I think he is not. Ought we to grant him the request? I think not.

6. Mr. Liang has another request, that we place him in the category of progressives or revolutionaries and not in the category of non-progressives or reactionaries. This is a question of "defining status", what should we do about it? In view of the above circumstances, can we put him in the progressive or the revolutionary category? What progressiveness is there in him? When, if ever, did he take part in the revolution? So we should not readily grant this request either. We'll have to wait and see.

7. In the last few years I have received a number of letters from the people asking why the Communist Party co-operates with reactionaries and have also heard some talk to the same effect. The reactionaries referred to are those who have never been willing to commit themselves, whether in the press or on public occasions, to opposing imperialism, feudalism, Chiang Kai-shek and his reactionary Kuomintang, and whose stand falls short of the minimum requirements of a government worker. Since these persons are particularly unwilling to oppose Chiang Kai-shek, Taiwan broadcasts and Hongkong newspapers have gone out of their way to express their appreciation, never abusing them but describing them as "men of the highest integrity" on the mainland. Liang Shu-ming is one of this bunch. On the other

hand, these broadcasts and newspapers pull out all the stops in slandering and vilifying some of our friends. The individuals extolled or never abused by Taiwan are of course *few in number but deserve close attention*.

There are certain persons who to this day would rather die than say a word against Chiang Kai-shek, though they don't mind saying a few words against imperialism. Whether in the press or in public statements, they dare not bring up the past, for they are still tender-hearted about it. I guess there are quite a few of them.

There are three kinds of patriotism, genuine patriotism, sham patriotism, and half-genuine and half-sham, vacillating, patriotism. Everybody knows which kind he comes under and so does Liang Shu-ming. We welcome all those who have truly broken their ties with imperialism and the Taiwan gang, no matter how backward they may be. They are genuine patriots. Sham patriots put on a fine mask, but underneath they are quite different. Vacillating elements are the third kind, they are half-genuine and half-sham in their patriotism, and shift and switch as the trend changes. If a third world war doesn't break out and Chiang Kai-shek doesn't come back, then they will go along with the Communist Party. If a third world war does break out, they will reconsider their course of action. Which of the three kinds makes up the majority? The genuine patriots. The genuine patriots have been on the increase in the last few years, the half-genuine and half-sham ones are small in number, and the sham patriots are only a handful but they do exist. It's up to you to look into the accuracy of this estimate.

8. There is a job I think Liang Shu-ming should do. It's a job not of "representing the peasants" and "appealing for their liberation" to the People's Government but of giving a clear account of the development over the years of his reactionary ideas against the people. He should make clear how he opposed the Communist Party and the people on behalf of the landlords in the past, and how he has now changed his stand from one of representing the landlords to one of "representing the peasants" — only when he is able to explain how this change has occurred, and make it convincing into the bargain, can we determine which category to put him in. He gives me the impression that he has never contemplated changing his reactionary stand. Nevertheless, to cure the sickness and save the patient, I suggest that he be given time for self-examination and that we refer the matter

to the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference instead of passing judgment on him now.

9. "All men have a sense of shame,"² and if a man has no sense of shame, it's hopeless. Mr. Liang says that he is wiser than the Communist Party on the peasant question — will anybody believe that? This is like showing off one's proficiency with the axe before Lu Pan the master carpenter. If, for instance, it should be said that "Mao Tsetung excels Mr. Mei Lan-fang in acting, or the Volunteers in digging tunnels, or the air force hero Chao Pao-tung in flying", wouldn't that be the acme of shamelessness? So the question posed by Mr. Liang is both serious and not serious and smacks of the ridiculous. He asserts that he is better qualified than the Communist Party to represent the peasants, isn't that ridiculous?

Now there are so many "representatives of the peasants", and who in the world do they represent? Do they represent the peasants? I don't think they look the part, nor do the peasants think so. They represent the landlord class and render it service. And the most prominent of them all is Liang Shu-ming, who with sweet words on his lips is actually helping the enemy. Some others among them are muddle-headed and have said stupid things, yet they are patriots and have China in their hearts. This is one type. Liang Shu-ming is another type. And there are others like him who pose as "representatives of the peasants". Fakes do exist, and now we are coming across them. Each of these persons has a tail like a fox, that's plain to all. The Monkey Sun Wu-kung is able to make seventy-two metamorphoses, but there is always one difficulty, changing his tail. He changes himself into a temple and turns his tail into a flagstaff, but the warrior god Yang Erh-lang spots the trick. And how? By spotting his tail. There is in fact a type of person who cannot hide his tail no matter how he disguises himself.

Liang Shu-ming is an ambitious schemer, a hypocrite. He lies when he says he takes no interest in politics and seeks no office. He used to engage in what he called "rural construction", and what sort of "rural construction" was it? Construction for the landlords, rural destruction and national ruin!

10. If you have dealings with that man you can't take him seriously. You can never thrash out any problem with him, for he follows no logic and only talks drivel. So I suggest that his problem be referred to the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference

for discussion at its bi-weekly forum. At the same time I should like to warn you not to entertain any hope of finding a real solution. That is absolutely impossible. The outcome can only be, "No decision after deliberation, no action even with a decision, and no fruitful result on adjournment." Even so, I advise you to try it out at the bi-weekly forum, for that is better than "sending a couple of people" to listen to his rigmarole.

II. Are we going to take this opportunity to break with him and have nothing more to do with him? No, we are not. So long as he wishes to have relations with us, we are ready to reciprocate. I still hope that he will be re-elected to the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference at its Second Plenary Session. That's because there are still people who are prone to be deceived by him and do not know him well, and he still has a role to play as live teaching material; he is therefore qualified for re-election, unless he himself has lost the desire to use the platform of the Political Consultative Conference to spread his reactionary ideas.

As I have said earlier, Liang Shu-ming has performed no service whatsoever and is good for nothing. Is he any good for providing us with products and paying income tax like the industrialists and businessmen? No, he is not. Is he any good for developing production and making the economy prosperous? No, he is not. Did he ever rebel? No, he did not. When, if ever, did he oppose Chiang Kai-shek or imperialism? Never. When, if ever, did he do anything to co-operate with the Chinese Communist Party in overthrowing imperialism and feudalism? Never. Therefore, he has performed no service. The man refused to nod his head in favour but shook it in disapproval of such a great struggle as the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea. Then, why is it that he is on the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference? Why is it that the Chinese Communist Party has nominated him for membership of this committee? Precisely because he can still deceive a number of people and has a certain deceptiveness. His credentials are deception, that's exactly what he has.

For Liang Shu-ming, whoever nods in recognition of his being correct is "magnanimous" and whoever fails to do so isn't. I am afraid we don't have such "magnanimity". But we have at least this much, that is, Liang Shu-ming, you can continue as a member of the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference.

12. Confucius, I hold, had the faults of not being democratic and of lacking a self-critical spirit, in a way rather like Mr. Liang. Confucius said, "Since I took Tzu Lu as a disciple, I have never heard ill of myself";³ his school "thrice filled up and thrice emptied",⁴ and he "executed Shaocheng Mao within three months of taking office"⁵ — he came close to being a despot and reeked of fascism. I hope my friends, and you Mr. Liang in particular, won't follow Confucius' example, and if you don't it will be most gratifying.

13. If Mr. Liang's lofty programme were followed, not only would socialism be impossible in China, but our parties (the other parties as well as the Communist Party) and our country would all be ruined. His line is the bourgeois line. Po I-po's mistake is a reflection of bourgeois ideas inside our Party. But Po I-po is better than Liang Shu-ming.

Liang Shu-ming says that the workers are "up in the ninth heaven" and the peasants are "down in the ninth hell". What are the facts? There is indeed a gap, with the workers earning more than the peasants, but after the agrarian reform the peasants now have land and houses and their life is improving every day. Some peasants fare even better than workers. Some workers are still in difficulty. What can be done to help the peasants earn more? Have you any suggestion, Liang Shu-ming? In your view, "the trouble lies not in scarcity but in uneven distribution".⁶ Your idea is not to have the peasants increase their income through their own efforts in production but to equalize the earnings of the workers and peasants by taking away part of the former's earnings to distribute among the latter. If your idea were adopted, wouldn't that spell the destruction of China's industry? Such a diversion of the workers' earnings would mean the ruin of our country and our parties. Don't think that ruin would befall the Communist Party alone, the democratic parties would be in it too.

You say the workers are "up in the ninth heaven", then in which heaven are you, Liang Shu-ming? You are up in the tenth heaven, the eleventh, the twelfth, nay, the thirteenth heaven, because you get a salary far bigger than a worker's wage! Yet what you propose to cut first is not your own salary but the workers' wages. I take this to be unfair. If you want to be fair, cut your own salary first because you are far above "the ninth heaven"!

Our Party has stood for the worker-peasant alliance for more than three decades. Marxism-Leninism stands precisely for alliance and

co-operation between workers and peasants. There are two alliances in China: one is the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, and the other is the alliance of the working class with the capitalists, professors, senior technical personnel, Kuomintang generals who have come over to our side, religious leaders, democratic parties and democrats without party affiliation. Both alliances are necessary and must continue. Which of the two is the base, which of the two is of primary importance? The alliance of the working class with the peasantry. Liang Shu-ming asserts that the worker-peasant alliance is in ruins and there is no hope for national construction. In other words, unless his ideas are adopted, the worker-peasant alliance has no hope of success, national construction cannot make headway, and there will be no hope for socialism! Indeed, there is no hope for the sort of "worker-peasant alliance" Liang Shu-ming has in mind. Yours is the bourgeois line. If your line were followed, the result would be the ruin of our country, China would be back on the old road of semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism, and there would be a rally in Peking to welcome Chiang Kai-shek and Eisenhower. Let me repeat, we'll never adopt your line!

Since we moved into the cities, Liang Shu-ming asserts, we have "forgotten" the countryside and it has become a "void". That's an attempt to foment discord. In the last three years we have devoted our main effort to rural work. It was only this year that we started diverting large numbers of leading cadres to urban work, but the bulk of our cadres are still working in the counties, districts and townships. How can it be asserted that we have forgotten the countryside!

Liang Shu-ming also accuses our rural work of being "backward" and our grass-roots cadres of "violating the law and discipline". What are known as backward townships do exist in the rural areas. But how many are there? Only 10 per cent. Why are they backward? Chiefly because reactionary elements, enemy gendarmes and agents, heads of reactionary secret societies, hooligans and ruffians, landlords and rich peasants have wormed their way in, become cadres and usurped the power of village governments, and some have even sneaked into the Communist Party. These types account for 80 to 90 per cent of the cadres guilty of serious violations of the law and of discipline, and degenerate cadres make up the rest. Therefore, the main problem in the backward townships is to strike at the counter-revolutionaries, but the degenerate cadres must be weeded out too. What is the proportion of the good and fairly good townships in the country as a whole? Ninety

per cent. We must have a clear idea about this situation and not be fooled by Liang Shu-ming.

14. Do we reject representations and gloss over errors? If the sort of idea advanced by Mr. Liang can be called a "representation", I declare that we do "reject representations". But we do not gloss over errors. We firmly stand for the leadership of the proletariat over all and sundry (workers, peasants, industrialists and businessmen, the nationalities, democratic parties and people's organizations, industry, agriculture, political and military affairs, in short, everything) and for both unity and struggle. If you want to sound us out, then this is one thing you will learn, a thing which is fundamental in nature. This is no trifling matter, is it?

15. Liang Shu-ming's problem has significance for the whole country and, like the case of Po I-po, should be taken up and discussed by the whole Party and the whole nation. Look for typical examples and unfold criticism and self-criticism. Let the whole nation discuss the general line.

There are two ways of making criticism: one is by self-criticism and the other by criticism. How shall we have it in your case, Liang Shu-ming? Will it be self-criticism? No, it will be criticism.

Our criticism of Liang Shu-ming is not directed against him alone, it is through him that we expose the reactionary ideas he represents. Reactionary as Liang Shu-ming is, we nevertheless treat his case as falling within the scope of ideological remoulding. Whether or not he can be remoulded is another question. Most likely he cannot be remoulded. It doesn't matter if he is beyond remoulding, for he is just one individual. However, a debate with him is useful. Don't think that we are making a mountain out of a molehill and that it is not worth the effort. Our debate with him will help clarify the question. If he is at all useful, this is where his usefulness lies. What's the question now under debate? Isn't it that of the general line? To clarify this question will be good for all of us.

NOTES

¹ By advocating "a colourless, transparent government" Liang Shu-ming was preaching that the government should be free of any party or faction coloration and should be a "colourless, transparent entity" transcending classes.

² *Mencius*, “Kao Tzu”, Part I.

³ This quotation is from the *Historical Records*, an ancient Chinese historical work. Tzu Lu was Confucius’ disciple and attendant. After Tzu Lu became his attendant, no adverse opinions ever reached Confucius.

⁴ “Confucius’ school thrice filled up and thrice emptied” is a quotation from “On Happy Omens” in the *Critical Essays* by Wang Chung of the Han Dynasty. Confucius ran a school in the state of Lu to glorify the reactionary slave system. Shaocheng Mao also ran a school, and Confucius’ disciples frequently flocked to hear him. As a result, Shaocheng Mao’s school was packed while Confucius’ school was often empty.

⁵ According to the *Historical Records*, Confucius served as Minister of Justice and then as acting Prime Minister of the state of Lu. He put his rival Shaocheng Mao to death within three months of assuming the latter post.

⁶ *Confucian Analects*, Book XVI, “Chi Shih”.

TWO TALKS ON MUTUAL AID AND CO-OPERATION IN AGRICULTURE

October and November 1953

I. THE TALK OF OCTOBER 15

Make a success of the agricultural producers' co-operatives and a big expansion of the mutual-aid teams will follow.

In the new liberated areas every county, whether large, medium-sized or small, should set up one or two successful co-operatives this winter and next spring after full preparations; there should be at least one, on the average one to two and at most three, depending on how well the work has been done. Quotas should be allotted. To make the quota too big would mean rash advance and to make it too small would be a Right deviation. To make the quota optional would be to let things drift. Can there be more than three? So long as the co-operatives meet the requirements, conform to the regulations and resolutions, are set up on a voluntary basis, have strong leading cadres (their two chief qualifications being fair-mindedness and competence) and are well run, then the more the better, as Han Hsin said about the number of troops he could command.¹

The prefectural and county Party committees should be urged to make vigorous efforts and do a good job. The rural work departments of the Central Committee bureaus and of the provincial and municipal Party committees should keep a firm grasp on this matter and make it the pivot of their work.

There should be control figures and an allotment of quotas. Allotment without compulsion — this is not commandism. After the October

Two talks to the responsible members of the Rural Work Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party before and during the Third Conference on Mutual Aid and Co-operation in Agriculture, which was convened by the Central Committee and held from October 26 to November 5, 1953.

conference, there are four or five months to go, that is, November and December this year, January and February next year, and in the north the month of March as well. We give clear notice now that early next year another meeting will be called to check up on the work. There will definitely be a check-up then to see- how it is getting on.

Certain minority nationality areas where the agrarian reform has not been completed can be exempted from setting up co-operatives. The small number of poorly managed counties, for instance, counties where backward townships account for 30 to 40 per cent of the total, where Party secretaries are incompetent and where the work cannot start without leading to trouble, can be exempted for the time being and given no quota. Nevertheless, the provincial and prefectural Party committees should assume responsibility for helping them to straighten things out and to create the conditions for starting the work next winter after the autumn harvest.

The general pattern is to proceed from the mutual-aid team to the co-operative, but it is also permissible to try and set up the co-operative directly. If you take the direct path and succeed, that will speed up the work. So why can't it be tried? It can.

The rural work departments at all levels should look upon mutual aid and co-operation as a matter of vital importance. Peasants working on their own cannot raise production to any great extent, therefore we must promote mutual aid and co-operation. If socialism does not occupy the rural positions, capitalism inevitably will. Is it possible to take any road other than the capitalist or the socialist road? The capitalist road can also lead to increased production, but the time required would be longer and the course painful. We will not practise capitalism, that's settled. Yet capitalism is bound to spread unchecked unless we go in for socialism.

The general line, the general programme, industrialization and socialist transformation should be discussed at the forthcoming October conference.

Both "sustain private property" and the "four big freedoms"² benefit the rich peasants and the well-to-do middle peasants. Why then are there relevant stipulations in the law? The law stipulates protection of private property, but the word "sustain" is not in it. Some peasants are selling their land now, which is not good, though the law does not prohibit it, we should make efforts to prevent them from doing so. Setting up co-operatives is the solution. Mutual-aid teams by themselves are not enough to stop peasants selling their land, only co-operatives,

and big ones at that, can do so. Moreover, big co-operatives can eliminate the need of some peasants to rent out land, for a big co-operative of one or two hundred households can solve the problem by taking in households of widows, orphans and others not provided for. The question of whether small co-operatives can likewise take in a few has to be studied. The mutual-aid teams should also help widows, orphans and others not provided for. If you can't set up a big co-operative, try a medium-sized one; if you can't set up a medium-sized co-operative, try a small one. But go for a medium-sized or big co-operative wherever possible, and don't be upset at the sight of a big one. A co-operative of one or two hundred households can be counted big, but a co-operative of even three or four hundred households is also possible. Setting up several sub-co-operatives under a big co-operative is an innovation, and it is by no means necessary to dissolve it. Running a co-operative well does not mean bringing everything to perfection. Absorb all kinds of experience, and don't impose the same pattern everywhere.

More co-operatives should be established in the old liberated areas. But some new liberated areas may set up co-operatives at a faster tempo than some old ones. For instance, the central Shensi plain may develop faster than northern Shensi, the Chengtu plain faster than Fuping and other such places. We must dispel the idea that the new liberated areas are destined to go slow. In fact the Northeast is not an old liberated area, its southern part not differing much from the new liberated areas south of the Great Wall. Kiangsu and the Hangchow-Chiahsing-Huchow region will probably overtake the mountainous old liberated areas in Shantung and North China, and so they should. Generally speaking, the new liberated areas may be allowed more time for their work, but in those places where the cadres are strong, the population is dense and the terrain level, co-operatives are likely to grow fairly quickly once a few models are set up.

There are now six thousand co-operatives in North China. If the figure is to be doubled, quotas can be allotted straight away. If the figure is to be tripled, those concerned should be consulted. We should allot quotas reasonably and have control figures, otherwise we shall be working without clear aims. The Northeast should increase its co-operatives by 100, 150 or 200 per cent, and so should North China. The control figures should not be too high, so that the localities may surpass them. Overfulfilment will greatly enhance people's enthusiasm.

In developing co-operatives, we should strive for quantity, quality and economy. By economy we mean no failures; failures are a waste of the peasants' energy, with the bad end-result of losses both politically and in the production of grain. Our final objective is to produce more grain, cotton, sugar-cane, vegetables, and so on. There will be no way out unless grain production is increased, otherwise neither the state nor the people will benefit.

Nor will there be a way out unless more vegetables are produced in the suburbs, otherwise neither the state nor the people will benefit. Since the outlying districts of the cities have rich soil and flat farmlands which moreover are publicly owned, big co-operatives may be set up there first. Of course, the work needs to be quite painstaking, and there is even less room for sloppiness, because growing vegetables is different from growing grain. We must set up pilot co-operatives and guard against rash advance.

To meet the urban demand for vegetables, we cannot rely on peasants working on their own to bring their produce to the market. Ways must be worked out at the production end as well as by the supply and marketing co-operatives. As regards vegetables for the large cities, there is a big contradiction between supply and demand at present.

There are also big contradictions between supply and demand in the cases of grain and cotton, and others will soon emerge in the cases of meat, fats and edible oils. Demand is growing fast and cannot be met.

To resolve the contradiction between supply and demand, it is necessary to resolve the contradiction between ownership and the productive forces. Should ownership be individual or collective? Capitalist ownership or socialist ownership? Abundant supplies and the relations of production under individual ownership are utterly incompatible with each other. There must be a transition from individual ownership to collective ownership, to socialism. There are elementary co-operatives where land is pooled as shares, and there are advanced co-operatives in which land is owned in common, that is, by the co-operative.

In a sense the purpose of the general line is the solution of the problem of ownership. State ownership is to be expanded by building new state enterprises and renovating and enlarging old ones. The two kinds of private ownership, that of the working people and that of the bourgeoisie, are to be changed respectively into collective ownership and state ownership (integration into socialism through joint state-private management). Only thus can the productive forces be expanded and China's industrialization accomplished. Only when the productive

forces have developed can the contradiction between supply and demand be resolved.

II. THE TALK OF NOVEMBER 4

Whatever we do must accord with reality, otherwise it is wrong. In order to do what accords with reality we must consider what is imperative and what is possible, and what is possible depends on political and economic conditions and the cadre situation. At present, it is at once imperative and possible to develop agricultural producers' co-operatives, for which there is a great potential. Failure to tap this potential means to mark time and make no advance. Our legs are for walking, and it is wrong to stand still all the time. It is not right to force the dissolution of co-operatives which meet the requirements, this is wrong no matter what the circumstances. The campaign to "check impetuosity and rash advance" was a gust of wind, wasn't it? As it blew from above, it brought down a number of agricultural producers' co-operatives that should have survived. An investigation should be made about such co-operatives, the findings made known and the mistake admitted, otherwise the township cadres and activists in those places will have pent-up grievances.

We must work for socialism. "Sustain private property" is a bourgeois concept. "To be together all day long and never talk about fundamentals but take pleasure only in giving small favours — indeed it's a hopeless case!" "Never talk about fundamentals" means never talking about socialism, never working for socialism. Agricultural credits, relief grain, taxation according to fixed rates, tax reduction and exemption according to law, small-scale water conservancy projects, wells and canals, deep ploughing and close planting, proper application of fertilizer, popularization of new-type walking ploughs, water-wheels, sprayers, insecticides, etc. — all these things are fine. But to do all this on the basis of the small peasant economy instead of by relying on socialism is to give the peasants small favours. Once these fine things are linked to the general line and to socialism, the case will be different, and they will no longer be small favours. We must work for socialism and link these fine things with it. As for "sustain private property" and the "four big freedoms", there is all the more reason to call them small favours, and besides, they are favours to the rich and well-to-do middle

peasants. To lay one's hopes for greatly increased grain production and for a solution of the food problem and of the all-important problem of the nation's economy and the people's livelihood not on socialism but on making much of the small peasant economy and on giving small favours on the basis of the individual economy — "indeed it's a hopeless case"!

As an old saying goes, "Once the headrope of a fishing net is pulled up, all its meshes open." It is only by taking hold of the key link that everything else will fall into its proper place. The key link means the main theme. The contradiction between socialism and capitalism and the gradual resolution of this contradiction — that is the main theme, the key link. Grasp this key link, and all kinds of political and economic work to help the peasants will fall under it.

There are contradictions both inside and outside the agricultural producers' co-operatives. The present co-operatives are semi-socialist, whereas peasants working on their own outside the co-operatives are entirely under the system of private ownership. Hence there is a contradiction between the two. The mutual-aid teams are different from the agricultural producers' co-operatives in that the former engage only in collective labour and do not affect ownership. The present-day co-operatives are built on the basis of private ownership, with privately owned land, draught animals and large farm implements pooled as shares. Hence there is also a contradiction inside the co-operatives between the socialist factors and private ownership, a contradiction which must gradually be resolved. In the future, when our present-day semi-public, semi-private ownership advances to collective ownership, this contradiction will be resolved. We are taking steady steps, moving first from mutual-aid teams which contain rudiments of socialism to semi-socialist and later to fully socialist co-operatives (which we still call agricultural producers' co-operatives, not collective farms). Generally speaking, the mutual-aid teams remain the foundation of the agricultural producers' co-operatives.

At one time, no mention was made of mutual aid and co-operation in several of our documents, and to all of them I added words to the effect that mutual aid and co-operation were to be developed or that necessary and feasible political and economic work was to be done. Some people wanted to make much of the small peasant economy, and this was why they concentrated on opposing excessive meddling with the peasants. True, there was some excessive meddling at that time. The "five excesses" from higher up were rammed through various

channels down to the lower levels, causing a lot of trouble. The “five excesses” should never be tolerated, whether in the villages, factories or army units. The Central Committee has issued several documents to combat excessive meddling, and this has done some good. What is meant by excessive meddling? Drawing up subjective plans at variance with reality and regardless of what is imperative and possible, or carrying out plans, even realistic ones, by means of commandism. Subjectivism and commandism are always bad and will be so even ten thousand years hence. They are bad for the scattered small peasant economy and no less so for the co-operatives. But to do what is both imperative and possible and moreover do it by means other than commandism — this cannot be called excessive meddling. The above ought to be the yardstick when reviewing our work. Whatever is subjectivist and unrealistic is wrong. Whatever is done through commandism is likewise wrong. To mark time and make no advance is a deviation to the Right; to go beyond what is practicable is a deviation to the “Left”. Both are manifestations of subjectivism. Rash advance is wrong, failure to set up co-operatives when they can be set up is also wrong, and forcible dissolution of co-operatives even worse.

“Life is hard in the villages, all is not well and the measures adopted do not suit the small peasant economy.” Such complaints exist inside as well as outside the Party. True, life is a bit hard in the villages, but we ought to make a proper analysis. In fact, life is not all that hard, the grain-deficient households account for only 10 per cent or so, and half of them are those of widows, orphans and other people without a provider, who are in great difficulty for lack of labour-power, but the mutual-aid teams and the co-operatives can give them some help. After all, things are much better for them than in Kuomintang days, and land has been distributed to them. Life is indeed hard for people in areas stricken by natural calamities, but they have received relief grain. The life of the peasants in general is good and is getting better; that is why 80 to 90 per cent of them feel happy and support the government. About 7 per cent of the rural population, the landlords and rich peasants, are dissatisfied with the government. “Life is hard in the villages, and things are terrible there” — certainly this has not been my view. Some people speak of the scattered nature as well as the hardships of the villages, that is, the scattered nature of the small peasant economy; but in doing so, they fail to mention forming co-operatives. To carry out the socialist transformation of the individual economy, to promote mutual aid and co-operation and to set up

co-operatives — this is not merely the direction to take but the immediate task before us.

But for the Conference on Financial and Economic Work held in July and August, the question of the general line would have remained unsettled for many comrades. The aim of that conference was mainly to settle this question. We criticized Po I-po precisely for his mistake in departing from the general line. In short, the general line means the gradual accomplishment of the socialist industrialization of our country and of the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. The planned purchase and supply of grain recently put into effect has given a big impetus to socialism. The present Conference on Mutual Aid and Co-operation, coming shortly after as it does, will give it another big impetus. In view of the fact that the campaign for mutual aid and co-operation has been held back for the better part of this year, the present conference should be more active in this respect. But our policies must be made clear. It is very important to make our policies known.

“Active leadership and steady development” — this is well put. The campaign has been held back for the better part of this year and has marked time without making any advance. This is not quite right. However, there is a positive side to it. It is like fighting battles. After each battle there should be time for rest and consolidation before starting the next. The trouble is that in some places too many of our positions have been given up, while in others it has not been a matter of giving up too many positions but failure to develop where development was possible and failure to allow any development or give it approval so that it became illegal. In this world it often happens that many new-born things which are correct are considered illegal. We ourselves were “illegal” in the past while the Kuomintang was “legal”. But these illegal co-operatives have held on to this day and are doing quite well. Can you still withhold recognition? You have to admit that they are legal, after all they have won out.

The conference has discussed active leadership and steady development, but you should anticipate some troubles. You may talk about being active and steady, and yet in practice you may fail to give active leadership or achieve steady development. Being active and steady entails setting control figures, assigning tasks and then checking whether they are fulfilled. Failure to fulfil what can be fulfilled is impermissible, it shows a lack of enthusiasm for socialism. According to the findings of our check-up, 5 to 10 per cent of the co-operatives have shown a drop

in output and are not doing so well. This is due to lack of active leadership. Of course, it is inevitable that a few co-operatives should show a fall in production because of poor management. However, if 20 per cent of the co-operatives, or even more, were to show a fall in production, that would be quite a problem.

The general line means a gradual change in the relations of production. According to Stalin, the system of ownership is the basis of the relations of production.³ Comrades must have a clear understanding of this point. At present, both private ownership and socialist public ownership are legal, but private ownership will gradually become illegal. To “sustain private ownership” of three *mou* of land and practise the “four big freedoms” is to facilitate the growth of a small number of rich peasants and follow the capitalist road.

County and district cadres must gradually switch their work to mutual aid and co-operation in agricultural production, to the promotion of socialism. If they are not working for socialism, what are they working for? For the individual economy? Secretaries of county and district Party committees must look upon working for socialism as a matter of major importance. Party secretaries must take charge, and I am the secretary of the Central Committee. Secretaries of the Central Committee bureaus, secretaries of the provincial, prefectural, county and district Party committees and secretaries at all levels must take charge and attend to the job in person. At present, the Central Committee is devoting 70 to 80 per cent of its efforts to the socialist transformation of agriculture. Similarly, to transform capitalist industry and commerce is also to work for socialism. Comrades of the rural work departments at all levels and all those present at this conference must become experts in the socialist transformation of agriculture and well versed in theory, line, policy and method.

To provide the cities with vegetables depends chiefly on planned supply. There are dense populations in the large and rising cities, and how can they possibly manage without vegetables? This problem must be solved. If it is not possible to ensure the production and supply of vegetables by setting up mutual-aid teams in the suburban areas, you can bypass that stage and set up semi-socialist or even fully socialist co-operatives. This question needs going into.

A plan for the development of the producers' co-operatives has been put forward. Over 32,000 co-operatives are to be set up this winter and next spring and right up to the time of the autumn harvest. By 1957, the number will have reached 700,000. But a sudden increase at one time

or another should be expected, and the number of co-operatives may rise to a million, or perhaps more. In short, set up co-operatives in large numbers and manage them well, give active leadership and achieve steady development.

This conference has been fruitful. If we had not held it and waited till next January, it would have been too late, and this winter would have slipped by. We shall hold another conference on March 26 next year and check up on how our plan has been carried out. It is a good idea for this conference to fix the date of the next meeting and to decide that it will review the implementation of the resolution adopted here. Next autumn we shall hold still another conference to discuss and decide on the tasks for the following winter.

NOTES

¹ Han Hsin was a leading general under Liu Pang, first emperor of the Han Dynasty. According to the *Historical Records*, Liu Pang once asked Han Hsin how many troops he could command. "The more the better," he answered.

² See p. 224 below.

³ J. V. Stalin, "Dialectical and Historical Materialism".

ON THE DRAFT CONSTITUTION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

June 14, 1954

This Draft Constitution obviously has popular support. From the discussions by more than five hundred people in Peking and by activists from various circles in the provinces and municipalities, that is, from the extensive discussions by over eight thousand people representative of the whole country, we can tell that the preliminary text was quite good and won general approval and support. At today's session many have also spoken in approval.

Why organize these extensive discussions? There are several advantages. First, will what has been worked out by the few meet the approval of the many? The discussions indicate that there is general approval of the main provisions and the basic principles of the preliminary text. All that is sound in the preliminary text has been retained. The fact that the ideas of a few leaders have won the approval of several thousand people shows that these ideas are well grounded, suitable and feasible. This gives us confidence. Second, in the discussions over 5,900 suggestions (not including queries) have been collected. They are of three kinds. The first consists of suggestions that are incorrect. The second consists of suggestions that are not so much wrong as unsuitable and that had better not be adopted. If they are not going to be adopted, why collect them? Does it do any good to collect these suggestions? Yes, it does. It enables us to know that such views about the constitution exist among the eight thousand people and to make comparisons. The third consists of those suggestions that have been adopted. These are of course very good and necessary. But for these suggestions, the preliminary text, although basically sound, would have remained imperfect, faulty and not well thought out. The draft in its present form may still

Speech at the Thirtieth Session of the Central People's Government Council.

have faults and imperfections, and we shall have to ask the people throughout the country for their opinions. As far as we can tell now, this draft is relatively free from imperfections, and that is the result of adopting rational suggestions.

Why has the Draft Constitution won popular support? I think one reason is that in drafting it we adopted the method of integrating the ideas of the leading body with those of the masses. This Draft Constitution combines the ideas of a few leaders with those of more than eight thousand people and, after publication, it will be discussed by the entire nation so that the ideas of the Central Committee will be integrated with those of the whole people. This is the way to integrate the leadership with the masses and with the large numbers of activists. We adopted this method in the past, and we shall do so in future. It should be used in all important legislation. By this method we have now produced a Draft Constitution which is fairly good and relatively free from imperfections.

Why do all of you here and the vast numbers of activists support the Draft Constitution and find it satisfactory? There are two main reasons: one is that it sums up the experience of the past and the other is that it combines principle with flexibility.

First, it sums up the experience of the past, especially that in our revolution and construction over the last five years. It sums up our experience in the people's revolution led by the proletariat against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism as well as our experience in social reform, economic construction, cultural construction and government work over the last few years. Besides, it sums up the experience in constitution-making since the last years of the Ching Dynasty, that is, from the Nineteen Constitutional Articles¹ in the final days of the Ching Dynasty to the Provisional Constitution of the Republic of China² in 1912, the various constitutions and draft constitutions under the governments of the Northern warlords,³ the Provisional Constitution of the Republic of China in the Period Under Political Tutelage of the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek regime and right up to Chiang Kai-shek's bogus constitution. One of these was positive in nature and the others negative. Thus the Provisional Constitution of the Republic of China in 1912 was a fairly good one for its time. Of course it had its imperfections and faults and was bourgeois in nature, but there was something revolutionary and democratic about it. It was concise and is said to have been drafted in haste, taking only a month from the time of its framing to its adoption. As for the other constitutions and

draft constitutions, they were altogether reactionary. This Draft Constitution of ours is chiefly a summing-up of our experience in revolution and construction, but at the same time it is a synthesis of domestic and international experience. Our constitution is of a socialist type. It is based mainly on our own experience but has drawn upon what is good in the constitutions of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. Speaking of constitutions, the bourgeoisie was the forerunner. The bourgeoisie, whether in Britain, France or the United States, was revolutionary for a period, and it was during this period that the bourgeoisie began making constitutions. We should not write off bourgeois democracy with one stroke of the pen and deny bourgeois constitutions a place in history. All the same, present-day bourgeois constitutions are no good at all, they are bad, particularly the constitutions of the imperialist countries, which are designed to deceive and oppress the majority of the people. Our constitution is of a new, socialist type, different from any of the bourgeois type. It is far more progressive than the constitutions of the bourgeoisie even in its revolutionary period. We are superior to the bourgeoisie.

Second, our Draft Constitution combines principle with flexibility.-

There are two basic principles, the principle of democracy and the principle of socialism. Our democracy is not bourgeois democracy but people's democracy, that is, a people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat and based on the worker-peasant alliance. The principle of people's democracy runs through the whole constitution. The other principle is that of socialism. Socialism already exists in our country today. The constitution stipulates that socialist transformation must be accomplished and the socialist industrialization of the country realized.-

That's our principle. To carry out this principle of socialism, are we to put socialism into practice overnight in every sphere throughout the country? This might seem very revolutionary, but for lack of flexibility it just won't work, it will meet with opposition and end in failure. So, what cannot be done for the moment must be given time to be done gradually. For instance, state capitalism, as stipulated, is to be put into practice gradually. It takes various forms, not just that of joint state-private management. Note the words "gradually" and "various". That is to say, state capitalism in various forms is to be put into practice gradually so as to attain socialist ownership by the whole people. Socialist ownership by the whole people is the principle, but in order to realize this principle we should combine it with flexibility. And flexibility means state capitalism, which takes not one but "various" forms, and

which is to be realized not overnight but “gradually”. That makes for flexibility. We write into our constitution what is feasible now and exclude what is not. Let us take for instance the material guarantees for civil rights. They will certainly expand when production grows in future, but the wording in the constitution is only “gradually expand”. This, too, means flexibility. Take another instance, the united front. This was written into the Common Programme. And now it is again written into the Preamble to the Draft Constitution. It is necessary to have a “broad people’s democratic united front composed of all democratic classes, democratic parties and groups, and people’s organizations”. This will serve to reassure the various social strata, the national bourgeoisie and the democratic parties as well as the peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie. And then there is the question of the minority nationalities, which has both its generality and its particularity. The general provisions in the constitution apply to its generality and the particular provisions to its particularity. The minority nationalities have characteristics of their own politically, economically and culturally. What are the characteristics of their economy? To cite one example. Article 5 of our Draft Constitution states that four forms of ownership of the means of production exist in the People’s Republic of China. In fact, there are other forms of ownership in our minority nationality areas. Does primitive communal ownership still exist in our country? I’m afraid it does among some minority nationalities. Similarly, slave ownership and feudal ownership still exist. From a contemporary standpoint the slave system, the feudal system and the capitalist system are all bad, but historically they were more progressive than the primitive communal system. These systems were progressive at first but not later on and were therefore supplanted in their turn. Article 70 of our Draft Constitution stipulates that the minority nationality areas “may, in the light of the political, economic and cultural characteristics of the nationality or nationalities in a given area, make regulations on the exercise of autonomy as well as specific regulations”. All these are instances of the integration of principle and flexibility.

This Draft Constitution has won general praise and support precisely for these two reasons: it correctly and properly sums up past experience, and it correctly and properly integrates principle and flexibility. Otherwise, I don’t think people would praise and support it.

It is entirely possible and it is necessary to put this Draft Constitution into force. Of course, it is still a draft today, but a few months from now, after it has been approved by the National People’s Congress, it

will be the formal constitution. We should be getting ready now to enforce it. Once it is approved, the whole nation, one and all, should observe it. State personnel particularly, and in the first place those present here, should take the lead in observing it. To fail to observe the constitution is to violate it.

When promulgated, our Draft Constitution will win the unanimous support of the whole people and enhance their enthusiasm. An organization must have rules, and so must a state. A constitution is a set of general rules, it is the fundamental law. To codify the principles of people's democracy and socialism in the form of a fundamental law, in the form of the constitution, so that there will be a clear course before the people of the whole country and they will feel sure they have a clear, definite and correct path to follow — this will heighten their enthusiasm.

Will this Draft Constitution produce an impact on the world when it is promulgated? Yes, it will, both on the democratic camp and on the capitalist countries. People in the democratic camp will be glad to see that we have charted a clear, definite and correct path. They will be glad because we Chinese are glad. The oppressed and exploited people in the capitalist countries will also be glad when they come to know about it. Of course there are some who will not be pleased, neither the imperialists nor Chiang Kai-shek will. Do you think Chiang Kai-shek will be happy? I say you know without asking him that he won't. We know Chiang Kai-shek only too well, he will definitely be against it. And President Eisenhower will not be happy either, he will say it's no good. They will say that this constitution of ours has charted a clear and definite but very bad path, a wrong path, and that socialism and people's democracy are blunders. Nor will they approve of our flexibility. What they would like best would be for us to conjure up socialism overnight and make a mess of everything. That would make them really happy. Also, they won't like China having a united front, they want us to play "a one-party game". Our constitution has national characteristics but at the same time has an international character; it's a national and also an international phenomenon. Many nations are oppressed by imperialism and feudalism, as we were once, and they are a majority of the world's population. It will be helpful to the people of these countries that we have a revolutionary constitution, a people's democratic constitution, and a clear, definite and correct path.

Our general objective is to strive to build a great socialist country. Ours is a big country of 600 million people. How long will it really take to accomplish socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation

and mechanization of agriculture and make China a great socialist country? We won't set a rigid time-limit now. It will probably take a period of three five-year plans, or fifteen years, to lay the foundation. Will China then become a great country? Not necessarily. I think for us to build a great socialist country, about fifty years, or ten five-year plans, will probably be enough. By then China will be in good shape and quite different from what it is now. What can we make at present? We can make tables and chairs, teacups and teapots, we can grow grain and grind it into flour, and we can make paper. But we can't make a single motor car, plane, tank or tractor. So we mustn't brag and be cocky. Of course I don't mean we can become cocky when we turn out our first car, more cocky when we make ten cars, and still more cocky when we make more and more cars. That won't do. Even after fifty years, when our country is in good shape, we should remain as modest as we are now. If by then we should become conceited and look down on others, it would be bad. We mustn't be conceited even a hundred years from now. We must never be cocky.

This constitution of ours is of a socialist type, but it is not yet a completely socialist constitution. It is a constitution for the transition period. We must now unite the people of the whole country and unite all the forces that can and should be united in the struggle to build a great socialist country. And the constitution has been drawn up specifically for this purpose.

Finally, a word by way of explanation. Some say that it is out of exceptional modesty on the part of certain individuals that some articles have been deleted from the Draft Constitution. This is not the way to put it. It is not out of modesty but because inclusion of these articles would be improper, unjustifiable and unscientific. In a people's democratic state like ours such improper articles ought not to be written into the constitution. We have not omitted, out of modesty, what ought to have been included. With science, modesty or immodesty is not the issue. Constitution-making is a matter of science. We must believe in science and nothing else, that is to say, we must not have blind faith in anything. What is right is right and what is wrong is wrong, whether it concerns the Chinese or foreigners, whether it concerns the dead or the living. To believe otherwise is blind faith. We must do away with blind faith. We should believe in what is correct and not in what is incorrect, be it ancient or modern. Not only that, we should criticize what is incorrect. This alone is the scientific approach.

NOTES

¹ This refers to the Nineteen Constitutional Articles promulgated by the Ching government in November 1911.

² The Provisional Constitution of the Republic of China was promulgated by Dr. Sun Yat-sen when he took office as Provisional President of the Republic of China after the 1911 Revolution.

³ These refer to the Yuan Shih-kai government's Temple of Heaven Draft Constitution of 1913 and its Provisional Constitution of 1914, the Tsao Kun government's Constitution of 1923 and Tuan Chi-jui's provisional government's Draft Constitution of 1925.

STRIVE TO BUILD A GREAT SOCIALIST COUNTRY

September 15, 1954

Fellow Deputies,

The First Session of the First National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China opens today in our capital, Peking.

The total number of deputies is 1,226, of whom 1,211 have registered for attendance and 15 were unable to register on account of illness or for other reasons and asked for leave of absence; 70 who registered cannot take part today on account of illness or for other reasons. The actual number of deputies present at today's meeting is 1,141, which constitutes a quorum.

The First Session of the First National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China is charged with important tasks.

The tasks of the present session are:

To adopt a constitution;

To enact a number of important laws;

To adopt the report on the work of the government; and

To elect the new leading personnel of the state.

Our present session is of great and historic significance. It is a milestone marking the new victories and advances of our people since the founding of our People's Republic in 1949. The constitution to be adopted at this session will tremendously promote the socialist cause in our country.

Our general task is to unite the whole people and win the support of all our friends abroad in the struggle to build a great socialist country, defend world peace and advance the cause of human progress.

The people of our country should work hard, do their best to draw on advanced experience in the Soviet Union and other fraternal coun-

Opening address at the First Session of the First National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China.

tries, be honest and industrious, encourage and help each other, guard against boastfulness and arrogance and gird themselves to build our country, which is at present economically and culturally backward, into a great industrialized country with a high standard of modern culture in the course of several five-year plans.

Ours is a just cause. A just cause is invincible before any enemy.

The force at the core leading our cause forward is the Chinese Communist Party.

The theoretical basis guiding our thinking is Marxism-Leninism.

We are fully confident that we can overcome all difficulties and hardships and make our country a great socialist republic.

We are advancing.

We are now engaged in a great and most glorious cause, never undertaken by our forefathers.

Our goal must be attained.

Our goal can unquestionably be attained.

Let all the 600 million people of our country unite and strive for our common cause!

Long live our great motherland!

LETTER CONCERNING THE STUDY OF *THE DREAM OF THE RED CHAMBER*

October 16, 1954

Enclosed are two articles refuting Yu Ping-po. Please read them. It is the first time in over thirty years that a serious attack has been levelled against the erroneous views of the so-called authorities on *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. The authors are two Youth League members. At first they wrote to the *Literary Gazette* to ask whether it was all right to criticize Yu Ping-po, but they were ignored. In the circumstances, they were obliged to write to their teacher at Shantung University, their alma mater, and they received support. Their article refuting "An Essay on *The Dream of the Red Chamber*" was published in the university journal *Literature, History and Philosophy*. Then the matter came up again in Peking. It was suggested that the *People's Daily* reprint the article in order to start a debate and carry on the criticism. This, too, came to naught because certain persons objected for a variety of reasons (the main ones being that it was "an article written by nobodies" and that "the Party paper is not a platform for free debate"). In the end a compromise was reached and the article was allowed to be reprinted in the *Literary Gazette*. Later, the "Literary Legacy" page of the *Kuangming Daily* carried another article by the two young men refuting Yu Ping-po's book, *Studies on "The Dream of the Red Chamber"*. It seems that a struggle may now be able to get under way against the Hu Shih school of bourgeois idealism in the field of classical literature, which has poisoned the minds of the young for more than thirty years. The whole thing has been set going by two "nobodies", while the "bigwigs" have ignored and obstructed it as is their wont; they go in for a united front with bourgeois writers on the question of idealism and become willing captives of the bourgeoisie.

Letter to the comrades of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and other comrades concerned.

The case is almost the same as with the films *Inside Story of the Ching Court*¹ and *The Life of Wu Hsun* when they were shown. *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which has been described by certain people as a film of patriotism but is in fact one of national betrayal, has never been criticized since it was shown all over the country. *The Life of Wu Hsun* has been criticized, but up to now no lessons have been drawn; what is more, such strange things have happened as tolerating Yu Ping-po's idealism while suppressing the lively critical essays by the "nobodies". This deserves our attention.

Towards such bourgeois intellectuals as Yu Ping-po, our attitude should naturally be one of uniting with them, but we should criticize their erroneous ideas which poison the minds of the young, and we certainly should not surrender to them.

NOTES

¹ *Inside Story of the Ching Court* was a reactionary film which vilified the patriotic Yi Ho Tuan Movement of 1900 and preached capitulation to imperialism. This film of national betrayal was extolled by Liu Shao-chi as one of "patriotism".

THE CHINESE PEOPLE CANNOT BE COWED BY THE ATOM BOMB

January 28, 1955

China and Finland are friendly countries. Our relations are based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

China and Finland have never come into conflict. In the past, China's wars with European countries were only with Britain, France, Germany, tsarist Russia, Italy, the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Holland; these countries all came from afar to commit aggressions against China, as in the invasions by the Anglo-French allied forces and by the allied forces of the eight powers, including the United States and Japan. Sixteen countries took part in the war of aggression against Korea, including Turkey and Luxembourg. All these aggressor countries claimed to be peace-loving while branding Korea and China as aggressors.

Today, the danger of a world war and the threats to China come mainly from the warmongers in the United States. They have occupied our Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits and are contemplating an atomic war. We have two principles: first, we don't want war; second, we will strike back resolutely if anyone invades us. This is what we teach the members of the Communist Party and the whole nation. The Chinese people are not to be cowed by U.S. atomic blackmail. Our country has a population of 600 million and an area of 9,600,000 square kilometres. The United States cannot annihilate the Chinese nation with its small stack of atom bombs. Even if the U.S. atom bombs were so powerful that, when dropped on China, they would make a hole right through the earth, or even blow it up, that would hardly mean anything to the universe as a whole, though it might be a major event for the solar system.

Main points of a conversation with Ambassador Carl-Johan (Cay) Sundstrom, the first Finnish envoy to China, when he presented his credentials.

We have an expression, millet plus rifles. In the case of the United States, it is planes plus the A-bomb. However, if the United States with its planes plus the A-bomb is to launch a war of aggression against China, then China with its millet plus rifles is sure to emerge the victor. The people of the whole world will support us. As a result of World War I, the tsar, the landlords and the capitalists in Russia were wiped out; as a result of World War II, Chiang Kai-shek and the landlords were overthrown in China and the East European countries and a number of countries in Asia were liberated. Should the United States launch a third world war and supposing it lasted eight or ten years, the result would be the elimination of the ruling classes in the United States, Britain and the other accomplice countries and the transformation of most of the world into countries led by Communist Parties. World wars end not in favour of the warmongers but in favour of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary people in all lands. If the warmongers are to make war, then they mustn't blame us for making revolution or engaging in "subversive activities", as they keep saying all the time. If they desist from war, they can survive a little longer on this earth. But the sooner they make war, the sooner they will be wiped from the face of the earth. Then a people's united nations would be set up, maybe in Shanghai, maybe somewhere in Europe, or it might be set up again in New York, provided the U.S. warmongers had been wiped out.

SPEECHES AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

March 1955

OPENING SPEECH

March 21, 1955

Comrade Delegates to the National Conference of the Communist Party of China,

There are three items on the agenda of our present National Conference: (1) the First Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy and a report on this plan; (2) a report on the anti-Party alliance of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih; and (3) the establishment of a central control commission.

Basing itself on Lenin's teachings on the transition period, the Central Committee summed up the experience gained after the founding of the People's Republic of China and in 1952 put forward the Party's general line for the transition period at the time when the stage of the rehabilitation of China's national economy was coming to an end. This general line means the accomplishment step by step of the socialist industrialization of the country together with the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce in a period of roughly three five-year plans and thus the attainment of the goal of building a socialist society in China. Practice has borne out the correctness of the Party's general line and of the important policies and measures adopted to implement it. There have been great achievements in our work thanks to the efforts of all comrades in the Party and of the people of the whole country. But there have also been shortcomings and mistakes. It is impossible for many of the measures we devised to be appropriate in all respects, and they have

to be supplemented and revised in the light of new experience in the process of being carried out.

The First Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy is a major step towards the realization of the Party's general line. The present National Conference should discuss this draft plan conscientiously in the light of our practical experience so as to make it relatively sound in content and therefore workable.

It is no easy job to build a socialist society in a large country like ours with its complicated conditions and its formerly very backward economy. We may be able to build a socialist society over three five-year plans, but to build a strong, highly industrialized socialist country will require several decades of hard work, say, fifty years, or the entire second half of the present century. Our task requires us to handle the relations among the people well, particularly those between the working class and the peasantry; it requires us to handle the relations among our different nationalities well. At the same time, it requires us to do a good job in furthering close co-operation with the Soviet Union, which is a great and advanced socialist country, and with the People's Democracies and also to promote co-operation with all the peace-loving countries and people in the capitalist world.

We often say that we should not become conceited because we have done well in our work and that we comrades should remain modest and learn from the advanced countries, from the masses and from each other so as to make fewer mistakes. I think all this still needs to be repeated at the present Party conference. We can see from the anti-Party case of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih that conceit and complacency do exist in our Party and indeed to a serious extent among certain comrades. Failure to overcome them will hinder the accomplishment of our great task of building a socialist society.

As you comrades all know, the emergence of the anti-Party alliance of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih was by no means accidental, but was an acute manifestation of the intense class struggle in our country at the present stage. The criminal aim of this anti-Party alliance was to split our Party and seize supreme power in the Party and the state by conspiratorial means, and thus pave the way for a counter-revolutionary come-back. Under the unified leadership of the Central Committee, our Party has smashed the anti-Party alliance and become still more united and consolidated. This is an important victory in our struggle for the cause of socialism.

The case of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih serves as an important lesson for our Party, and all the members should take warning and make sure that similar cases will not recur in the Party. Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih schemed and conspired, operated clandestinely in the Party and surreptitiously sowed dissension among comrades, but in public they put up a front to camouflage their activities. These were precisely the kind of vile activities the landlord class and the bourgeoisie usually resorted to in the past. In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx and Engels say, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims." As Communists, let alone as senior Party cadres, we must all be open and above-board politically, always ready to express our political views openly and take a stand, for or against, on each and every important political issue. We must never follow the example of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih and resort to scheming.

For the purpose of building a socialist society, the Central Committee deems it necessary at this juncture to set up a central control commission in accordance with the Party Constitution to replace the old Discipline Inspection Commission. Its aim is to tighten Party discipline in the new period of intense class struggle, step up the struggle against all kinds of violations of the law and of discipline and in particular guard against the recurrence of cases like the Kao-Jao anti-Party alliance which seriously jeopardizes the interests of the Party.

In view of the various lessons of the past and the fact that only through being integrated with collective wisdom can individual wisdom be turned to better account so that fewer mistakes are made in our work, the Central Committee and the Party committees at all levels must adhere to the principle of collective leadership and continue to oppose two deviations, personal dictatorship and decentralism. We must understand that collective leadership and personal responsibility are two aspects which are not opposed but are linked to each other. And personal responsibility and personal dictatorship, which violates the principle of collective leadership, are two entirely different things.

Internationally, conditions at present are favourable to our socialist construction. The socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is strong and its ranks are united, while the imperialist camp is weak and beset by numerous insurmountable contradictions and crises. Even so, we should realize that we are still surrounded by imperialist forces and must be prepared against all possible emergencies. If the imperialists should unleash a war in the future, very likely they would launch

a surprise attack, as in World War II. Therefore, we must be prepared, mentally and materially, to avoid being caught unawares by such a sudden turn. This is one aspect of the matter. The other aspect is that the remaining counter-revolutionary forces inside the country are still very active, and, basing ourselves on the facts, we must deal them more blows in a planned and discriminating way so as to further weaken these hidden counter-revolutionaries and ensure the safety of our socialist construction. If we take proper measures with regard to these two aspects, we can prevent our enemies from doing us serious harm; otherwise, we may make mistakes.

Comrades, we are now in a new historical period. For a country in the Orient with a population of 600 million to make socialist revolution, to change its face and the course of its history, to accomplish its basic industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce in a period of roughly three five-year plans and to catch up with or surpass the most powerful capitalist countries in the world in several decades — in doing all this it will inevitably encounter difficulties as numerous as or perhaps even greater than those encountered in the period of the democratic revolution. Nevertheless, comrades, we Communists are known for our dauntlessness before difficulties. Tactically, we must take all difficulties seriously. We must adopt a serious attitude towards each specific difficulty, create the necessary conditions, study the methods for coping with them and overcome them one by one and batch by batch. Our experience over the past decades shows that we did succeed in overcoming every difficulty encountered. Every kind of difficulty has to give way before Communists, just as in the saying, “Mountains bow their heads and rivers make way.” The lesson derived from this is that we can scorn difficulties. Here we are talking of strategy, of the situation as a whole. However great the difficulty, we can readily take its measure. Difficulties are nothing but what both our enemies in society and Nature put in our way. We know that the imperialists, the domestic counter-revolutionaries, their agents in our Party, and so on, are mere moribund forces, while we ourselves constitute the new-born forces with truth on our side. Against them we are always invincible. A review of our history will enable us to see the point. When our Party was first founded in 1921, it was very small and had only a few score members, yet later it grew in strength and succeeded in overthrowing its powerful domestic enemy. Nature as an enemy can be conquered,

too. In Nature as in society, all new-born forces are intrinsically invincible. Conversely, all the old forces, however numerous, are bound to be eliminated. Therefore, we can and must scorn all the difficulties we encounter in this world, however immense they may be, and regard them as beneath contempt. Such is our optimism. It is based on scientific grounds. Provided that we know more about Marxism-Leninism and the natural sciences, in short, more about the laws of the objective world and make fewer mistakes of a subjectivist kind, we are sure to attain our goals in revolution and construction.

CONCLUDING SPEECH

March 31, 1955

Comrades,

The speeches from the floor have ended. Now I'll say a few words on the following questions: an evaluation of the present conference, the Five-Year Plan, the case of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih, the current situation, and the Eighth Congress.

1. EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT CONFERENCE

Most comrades agree that the conference has been a great success and that it has been another rectification meeting, following the rectification of the Yen-an days. Democracy has been promoted and criticism and self-criticism carried out, which has enabled us to know each other better, think more along the same lines and arrive at a common understanding. There was common understanding among us, but on some questions opinions differed, and this conference has enabled us to unify our understanding. Our Party will be better united on this basis, that is, on the basis of our common understanding of ideology, politics and various policies. As Comrade Chou En-lai put it, if the Seventh National Congress of the Party and the all-Party ideological and political rectification in the period preceding it laid the foundation of our Party's ideological unity, a unity on which we proceeded to win victory in the democratic revolution against imperialism,

feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, then the present conference will enable us to win victory for socialism.

This conference has proved that our Party has attained a much higher level. Our Party has made great strides not only since the Seventh Congress ten years ago, but also since the Second and Third Plenary Sessions of the Seventh Central Committee in 1949 and 1950. This is good, the conference indicates our progress.

We have entered a period, a new period in our history, in which what we have set ourselves to do, think about and dig into is socialist industrialization, socialist transformation and the modernization of our national defence, and we are beginning to do the same thing with atomic energy. So far as the Party as a whole is concerned, some comrades are digging deep into their jobs while others are not, and this is true of the comrades present at this conference. As is the case with doctors, some can perform operations, others can't. Some can give intravenous injections while others can't and know only how to give subcutaneous injections. And there are doctors who don't dare to go beneath the skin and can work only on the surface. Although some are not digging into their jobs, most comrades are, and quite a few seem to have learned their trade and are becoming rather expert at it. This has been borne out at this conference and is a very good thing. For we are now confronted with new problems, socialist industrialization, socialist transformation, a new defence system and other new fields of work. It is our task to adapt ourselves to this new situation, dig into our jobs and become experts. It is therefore necessary to educate those who have failed to dig into their jobs and remained on the surface, so that they will all turn into experts.

The struggle against the anti-Party alliance of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih will take our Party a big step forward.

We must propagate dialectical materialism among the five million intellectuals inside and outside the Party and among cadres at all levels so that they will grasp it and combat idealism, and we shall then be able to organize a powerful corps of theoretical workers, which we urgently need. That again will be a very good thing.

We must draw up a plan for the formation of such a corps with several million people taking up the study of dialectical materialism and historical materialism, the theoretical basis of Marxism, and combating all shades of idealism and mechanical materialism. At present there are many cadres doing theoretical work, but there is still no corps of theoretical workers, much less a powerful one. Without

such a corps, the cause of the entire Party, the socialist industrialization and socialist transformation of our country, the modernization of our national defence and our research in atomic energy cannot move along or succeed. I therefore recommend that you comrades read philosophy. Quite a few people are not interested in philosophy and have not cultivated the habit of reading it. They can begin by reading pamphlets or short articles and, after their interest is thus aroused, tackle books running to a length of seventy thousand or eighty thousand and then even several hundred thousand words. Marxism consists of several branches of learning: Marxist philosophy, Marxist economics and Marxist socialism, that is, the theory of class struggle, but the foundation is Marxist philosophy. If this is not grasped, we will not have a common language or any common method, and we may keep on arguing back and forth without making things any clearer. Once dialectical materialism is grasped, a lot of trouble will be saved and many mistakes avoided.

2. ON THE FIRST FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Comrades say that during the discussion of the Five-Year Plan most speeches were good and they all feel satisfied with them. Some speeches were exceptionally good, for the speakers gave thorough expositions and sounded rather like experts. But some of the speeches delivered on behalf of the central departments were rather poor in content and left something to be desired in the way of analysis and criticism. The same holds for some of the speeches by comrades from different localities. Then there is something else. In certain speeches the grave problem of waste and other errors were exposed for what they are, but nothing was said about ways to tackle them. Some comrades are dissatisfied with these speeches. I think there is cause for such dissatisfaction.

I hope that all secretaries of provincial, municipal and prefectural Party committees and the comrades in charge of the central departments will strive to become expert in political and economic work on the basis of a higher level of Marxism-Leninism. They must do well both in political and ideological work and in economic construction. As for the latter, we must really get to know how to do it.

In regard to the many problems submitted by the local authorities at this conference to the central authorities for solution, efforts should

be made to solve them in those cases where guidelines have been laid down by the Central Committee. As for the other problems, the secretariat of the conference should work out solutions with the comrades who raised them and submit reports to the Central Committee for decision.

Then there are also many matters in which the central departments would like to enlist the co-operation of the local authorities. The local Party committees are requested to supervise and help the enterprises of the central departments in different localities, particularly in regard to political and ideological work. It is incumbent upon the local Party committees to help these enterprises to fulfil their tasks. Therefore, not only do the local authorities have demands on the central authorities, but the same is true the other way round. The First Five-Year Plan can be successfully carried out only when the central departments and the local Party committees bend their efforts in a single direction and work in co-operation with a due division of labour.

3. ON THE ANTI-PARTY ALLIANCE OF KAO KANG AND JAO SHU-SHIH

The first point. Some ask, "Was there or was there not such an alliance? Were there perhaps two independent kingdoms or two go-it-alone firms, and not an alliance?" Some comrades say that they have not come across any document and that if Kao and Jao had an alliance, there must be some kind of agreement, and an agreement must be in black and white. To be sure, there is no written agreement, it's nowhere to be found. We say Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih did have an alliance. How did we find this out? First, we found it out when Kao Kang worked hand in glove with Jao Shu-shih during the Conference on Financial and Economic Work. Second, we found it out when Jao Shu-shih collaborated with Chang Hsiu-shan in their anti-Party activities during the Conference on Organizational Work. Third, we found it out from Jao Shu-shih's own words. He said, "From now on Kuo Feng will serve as the pivot of the Organization Department of the Central Committee." Jao Shu-shih was director of the Organization Department and Kuo Feng, Kao Kang's confidant, was to be the pivot there. Very fine! What perfect unity! Fourth, we found it out when Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih spread far and wide a list of prospective Political Bureau members illicitly drawn up by An Tzu-wen. For this An Tzu-wen was given disciplinary warning. Kao Kang, Jao Shu-shih

and others spread this list to all those attending the Conference on Organizational Work and even had it circulated in the southern provinces. What was their motive in giving it such wide currency? Fifth, we found it out when Kao Kang twice expressed to me his wish to have Jao Shu-shih protected, while Jao Shu-shih went on protecting Kao Kang right up to the end. Kao Kang said that Jao Shu-shih was now in hot water and wanted me to help him out. Why, I asked, are you speaking for him? I'm in Peking and so is Jao Shu-shih. Why does he want you to speak for him and not come to me direct? Even if he were in Tibet, he could send a telegram. He is right here in Peking and he's got legs. The other occasion was the day before Kao Kang was exposed, and he tried once more to protect Jao Shu-shih. Jao Shu-shih persisted to the end in protecting Kao Kang and wanted to redress the "injustices" done to Kao Kang. At an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee to expose Kao Kang, I said there were two headquarters in Peking. The first headed by me stirred up an open wind and lit an open fire. The second headed by others stirred up a sinister wind and lit a sinister fire; it was operating underground. Did political leadership come from one or more sources? Judged by the many facts mentioned above, they did have an anti-Party alliance and were not two independent kingdoms or two go-it-alone firms which had nothing to do with each other.

Now about the doubts expressed by some comrades to the effect that since there was no written agreement, perhaps there wasn't an alliance after all. This is putting anti-Party alliances knocked together by schemers on a par with open and formal political and economic alliances in general and regarding the two as of the same kind. They were conspiring. Does a conspiracy need a written agreement? If no written agreement means no alliance, then how about each of the two anti-Party cliques headed separately by Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih? Kao Kang didn't sign any covenant with Chang Hsiu-shan, Chang Ming-yuan, Chao Teh-tsun, Ma Hung and Kuo Feng who were in his clique. Anyway we have not seen any written agreement of theirs. Then is the existence of this anti-Party clique, too, to be denied? Neither have we seen any covenant signed by Jao Shu-shih with Hsiang Ming and Yang Fan. So it is wrong to say that no alliance can exist without a written agreement.

The second point. What should be the attitude of comrades who fell under the influence of Kao and Jao and of those who did not? Those who did were influenced in varying degrees. Some were in-

fluenced in a general way, Kao and Jao brushed them with their wings. A few comrades were deeply influenced, they talked over many things with Kao and Jao, carried on clandestine activities and spread their views. There is a difference between these two categories of people. But whatever the degree of such influence, most comrades have made their attitude clear at this conference. Some were very good in their attitude and this was welcomed by all. Some others were fairly good in their attitude and this was welcomed by most of the comrades, though what they said was not free from shortcomings. Some didn't go far enough but have followed up with supplementary remarks today. Some speeches were good on the whole, but had parts that were not quite right. In any case, all of them have more or less indicated where they stand, and we should welcome that. After all they have done something to make their positions clear. A few comrades who wanted to speak but didn't for lack of time can send in written reports to the Central Committee. With those who have not spoken the problem is not serious, they just got grazed and were privy to some of the doings of Kao and Jao but failed to reveal them. As for those who have spoken, aren't there some who are still holding something back? Well, let it now be decided that comrades can get back their speeches and reports for revision, whether they were on the Five-Year Plan or on the anti-Party alliance of Kao and Jao. These comrades may go over their wording carefully and have five days to change whatever they had said inadequately or not quite correctly. Don't get a handle on anyone to make things hard for him in the future merely because he said something not quite right at this conference. You are allowed to make corrections and your revised text will be taken as final.

We should take this attitude towards these comrades, that is, we should not only observe but also help them, in the hope that they will correct their mistakes. In other words, we should not only observe them to see whether they are going to correct their mistakes but also help them to do so. Everybody needs help. With all its beauty the lotus needs the green of its leaves to set it off. A fence needs the support of three stakes, an able fellow needs the help of three other people. To go it alone is no good, and help from others is always necessary. And this is all the more necessary on the matter in question. It is necessary to observe these people, to see whether they are going to mend their ways. But merely to observe them is passive, it is also necessary to give them help. As for those comrades who fell under the influence of Kao and Jao, regardless of the extent, we should be glad to see them mend

their ways and should not only observe but also help them. Such is the positive attitude towards comrades who have made mistakes.

Comrades who did not come under their influence should not become conceited but should guard against this sort of disease. This is extremely important. Among the comrades mentioned earlier, probably some were duped and others rather deeply involved. But having made mistakes, these comrades may become more or less alert and avoid similar mistakes in future. You become immune to some diseases after having them. Vaccination has a preventive effect. But it is not a sure guarantee and you may still get smallpox. Therefore it is better to have another vaccination — in our case another meeting of the present kind — after a lapse of three or five years. Other comrades should not be conceited, but should guard against making mistakes. Why didn't Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih approach these people? There are several categories. The first category consists of those they regarded as their enemies, and naturally they would not try to influence them. The second consists of those they looked down upon as of no consequence, and they felt no need to influence them at this stage, thinking that these people would automatically come over when the "country was well under control". The third category consists of those they did not dare to approach, probably because these people were better immunized and didn't look like the sort of people they wanted; although they didn't regard them as enemies or as of no consequence, nevertheless they did not dare to approach them. The fourth category consists of those they hadn't had time to influence. This sort of plague takes time to spread. Defer the exposure for another year and you can't be sure that some more might not have become infected. So don't play the braggart and say, "Look, haven't you got smirched? But see how clean I am!" If the exposure had been put off for another year, I dare say quite a few people would have been affected.

The above, I believe, should arouse the attention of both the comrades who fell under the influence of Kao and Jao and those who did not.

The third point. On matters of principle, we should constantly be on our guard and keep a certain distance from comrades when their remarks or actions run counter to Party principles. Whenever their remarks and actions do run counter to Party principles and repel us, we should not identify ourselves with them on such matters and in such circumstances. As for their remarks and actions which conform to Party principles, on such matters as the Five-Year Plan, the resolu-

tion and report on the anti-Party alliance of Kao and Jao, our correct policies and Party rules and regulations, we should of course give them strong backing and identify ourselves with them. We should keep a certain distance from whatever is inconsistent with Party principles, in other words, we should draw a clear line of demarcation and rebuff it then and there. We should not fail to keep this distance merely because someone is an old friend, an old superior, an old subordinate, an old colleague, a schoolmate or a fellow townsman. We have repeatedly had this experience in the current anti-Party case of Kao and Jao and in the previous two-line struggles in the Party: when on account of an old and intimate relationship with certain people you find it difficult to speak out and fail to keep a certain distance, give any rebuff and draw a clear line of demarcation, you'll find yourself more and more deeply involved and haunted by their "ghosts". Therefore we must take a stand and adhere to principle.

The fourth point. Some comrades say, "We knew of some of the bad deeds of Kao and Jao, but did not discern their plot." I would say there are two categories. First, there are those who heard Kao and Jao say many things which were against Party principles, and furthermore Kao and Jao consulted with them on some of their anti-Party activities. These people should have discerned their plot. Second, there are those who learned of their bad deeds in a general way but did not realize they had a plot. These people are not to blame, for it was not easy to discern. It was only in 1953 that the Central Committee detected their anti-Party conspiracy. After what happened at the Conferences on Financial and Economic Work and on Organizational Work and after all the goings-on prior to the Conference on Financial and Economic Work, we realized that they were not behaving normally. During the Conference on Financial and Economic Work their unusual activities were discovered and on each occasion they were rebuked. So from then on they switched over completely to undercover activities. It was not until the autumn and winter of 1953 that we detected this conspiracy, the conspirators and the cliques. For quite some time we had no idea that Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih were bad types. This kind of thing had happened before. During the Ching Kang Mountains period there were a few renegades, and we never suspected that they would betray the revolution. Very likely you have all had similar experiences.

We should draw a lesson here: Don't be misled by false appearances. Some of our comrades are easily misled by them. There is contradiction

between appearance and essence in everything. It is by analysing and studying the appearance of a thing that people come to know its essence. Hence the need for science. Otherwise, if one could get at the essence of a thing by intuition, what would be the use of science? What would be the use of study? Study is called for precisely because there is contradiction between appearance and essence. There is a difference, though, between the appearance and the false appearance of a thing, because the latter is false. Hence we draw the lesson: Try as far as possible not to be misled by false appearances.

The fifth point. The danger of conceit. Don't play the braggart. Our cause depends on the many for its success and the few play only a limited role. While the few, that is, the leaders and cadres, play a role that should be recognized, it is not a role of signal importance. The role of signal importance is played by the masses. The correct relationship between the cadres and the masses is such that, necessary as the cadres are, it is the masses who do the actual work, with the cadres giving leadership, a role which should not be exaggerated. Would things be in a mess without you? Things can get along without you, as history and many facts of life can testify. Have things been in a mess, say, without Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih? Well, things are going quite well, aren't they? Without Trotsky, without Chang Kuo-tao, without Chen Tu-hsiu, things have gone quite well, too. They were all bad characters. Confucius has been dead for ages and today we have a Communist Party in China, which is surely wiser than Confucius; this goes to show that we can do better without Confucius. As for good people, they are not indispensable either. Would the earth stop turning without them? The earth will go on turning all the same. Things will proceed as usual or perhaps even better.

We have two kinds of people. The first are the veterans, and many of you here are high in seniority; the second are the new blood, the young people. Which of the two holds out greater promise? Certainly the new blood, as Comrade Chou En-lai said today. Some comrades are swollen with pride just because they are veterans of the revolution. This is quite unwarranted. If allowance is to be made for being proud of oneself, it is rather the young people who have something to be proud of. As for people over forty or fifty, the older they are and the more experience they have, the more modest they should be. Leave it to the young people to realize that we are really experienced: "These veterans do have some experience. We should not underrate them.

Look, how modest they are!” If people over forty or fifty became conceited in spite of their rich experience, what sorry figures they would cut! That would start the young talking, “All your experience is nothing, you are behaving just like kids.” Young kids may like to show off a bit, that’s understandable. But for people who are getting on in years and have so much experience behind them to be conceited and so cocky, that’s quite uncalled for. As the saying goes, “Behave yourself and tuck your tail between your legs.” Human beings have no tails, but why talk about tucking the tail between the legs? Let a dog illustrate our point. There are times when a dog sticks its tail up and there are times when it tucks its tail between its legs. Generally, it tucks its tail between its legs when beaten and sticks its tail up when doing fine. I hope all our comrades, and veteran comrades most of all, will, so to speak, tuck their tails between their legs rather than stick them up, guard against conceit and rashness, always remain modest and keep forging ahead.

The sixth point. Guard against “Left” and Right deviations. Some people say, “It is better to be on the ‘Left’ than on the Right,” a remark repeated by many comrades. In fact, there are many who say to themselves that “It is better to be on the Right than on the ‘Left’”, but they don’t say it aloud. Only those who are honest say so openly. So there are these two opinions. What is “Left”? To move far ahead of the times, to outpace current developments, to be rash in action and in matters of principle and policy and to hit out indiscriminately in struggles and controversies — these are “Left” deviations and are no good. To fall behind the times, to fail to keep pace with current developments and to be lacking in militancy — these are Right deviations and are no good either. In our Party there are people who prefer to be on the “Left”, and then there are also quite a few who prefer to be on the Right or to take a position right of centre. Neither is good. We must wage a struggle on both fronts, combating both “Left” and Right deviations.

That’s all I want to say about the anti-Party alliance of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih.

4. ON THE CURRENT SITUATION

How do things stand with respect to the international situation, the situation at home and that in the Party? Which is predominant — the

bright side or the dark? It must be affirmed that the bright side predominates over the dark whether internationally, at home or in the Party. Likewise with our conference. Don't think that everything is dark merely because so many people have made a self-criticism. These comrades laid the emphasis on their shortcomings and mistakes and did not touch on their positive points, leaving out such things as the time when they joined the revolution, the battles they won and the successes they achieved in their work. If you judge by their self-criticism alone, then there is nothing but darkness. In fact this is only one side of the story and for many comrades the secondary one. The case is different with Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih and their five lieutenants, Chang Hsiu-shan, Chang Ming-yuan, Chao Teh-tsun, Ma Hung and Kuo Feng. The estimate that the bright side is predominant cannot apply to them. What predominant bright side is there in Kao Kang's case? There is darkness through and through, a mass of murkiness which neither moonlight nor sunlight can penetrate. Things are quite different with our comrades. They are stained with a few dark spots which can be removed by the repeated use of soap.

Why do we call for preparedness against a sudden turn of events, against a counter-revolutionary come-back and against the recurrence of an incident of the Kao-Jao kind? Because we have nothing to lose if we are prepared for the worst. Whatever work we do, we must envisage the worst possibilities and plan accordingly. The worst that might happen can only be the following: a new world war unleashed by the imperialists, Chiang Kai-shek back in the saddle in Peking, and the recurrence of such incidents as the Kao-Jao anti-Party alliance, and what is more, not just one of these events may occur but as many as ten or even a hundred. But whatever their number, as long as we are prepared beforehand there is no cause for alarm. If ten happen, that means only five pair and there is nothing to make a fuss about since we have anticipated them all. Imperialism brandishes its atom bomb and hydrogen bomb to scare us and that doesn't frighten us either. The world is so constituted that there is always one thing to conquer another. When one thing is used for attack, there is bound to be another to conquer it. If you read the novel *Apotheosis of Heroes*,¹ you will know that there is no such thing as an invincible "magic weapon". Hosts of "magic weapons" have in fact been defeated. We believe that so long as we rely on the people there is no invincible "magic weapon" in this world.

5. STRIVE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL CONVOCATION OF THE EIGHTH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE PARTY

The Central Committee has decided to convene the Eighth National Congress of the Party in the second half of 1956. There will be three items on the agenda: (1) a report on the work of the Central Committee; (2) the revision of the Party Constitution; and (3) the election of a new Central Committee. The election of delegates and the preparation of documents should be completed before July next year. We call for a big step forward within a little over a year in all fields of work: the economy, culture and education, military affairs, the Party, politics and ideology, mass organizations, the united front and the minority nationalities.

In passing, a few words about minority nationality work. We must combat Han chauvinism. Don't get the idea that it is the Han nationality that has been helping the minority nationalities. In fact, the minority nationalities have been helping the Han nationality a great deal. Some comrades like to brag about the help given to the minority nationalities, but they don't realize that we can't do without the minority nationalities. Who is it that inhabits 50 to 60 per cent of our territory, the Hans or the other nationalities? The minority nationalities. Rich resources and hidden wealth abound in these areas. Till now we have given the minority nationalities little help and in some places no help at all, whereas the minority nationalities have rendered help to the Hans. Some minority nationalities, however, must have our help first before they can help us. Politically the minority nationalities have given the Han nationality big help; their participation in the community of the Chinese nation constitutes political help to the Han nationality. The people of the whole country are pleased that the minority nationalities and the Hans are united. So the minority nationalities have been a great help politically, economically and in national defence to the whole country, the whole Chinese nation. It is wrong to think that only the Hans have helped the minority nationalities while the minority nationalities have not helped the Hans, or to swell with pride over the little help given to the minority nationalities.

When we say that a big step forward must be taken in all fields within a year, we mean that the shortcomings and mistakes exposed must be remedied. Don't just make promises at this conference and leave these shortcomings and mistakes intact and uncorrected when

the Eighth Congress is convened next year. What we mean by striving for the convocation of the Eighth Congress is precisely to have our shortcomings and mistakes remedied. For instance, we must make conscientious efforts to do away with extravagance and waste and the big-roof style of architecture. Don't make promises here and the moment you are home, stretch out and go to sleep.

Some people suggest that a conference of this kind should be held either annually or every other year so that there can be mutual supervision among comrades. I think the suggestion is worth considering. Who is to exercise supervision over people like us? Mutual supervision is a good idea, it will promote the rapid progress of the cause of the Party and the state. We need rapid progress, not slow. We haven't had a Party congress for ten years. Of course, in the first five years it would not have been right to call another congress because the war was going on with all its stresses and strains and because the Seventh Congress had met. During the second five years a congress could have been held but it wasn't. Still something was gained by not convening it. It was better to get to the bottom of the case of Kao and Jao before the congress, or otherwise they would have made full use of the Eighth Congress for their own ends. In the meantime, our Five-Year Plan is well under way, we have put forward the general line for the transition period and through this conference we have achieved greater unity in thinking, thus paving the way for the Eighth National Congress of the Party. While not every delegate will be required to make a self-criticism at the forthcoming congress, there should be open criticism and self-criticism of shortcomings and mistakes in our work. It is wrong not to apply this Marxist principle.

Criticism should be sharp. I don't find the criticism made by some comrades at this conference very sharp; they seem to be afraid of offending others. If you are not sharp enough, if the sting doesn't reach home, the person criticized will not feel any pain and take any heed. Identify by name the person and the department involved. You have done a poor job and I am not satisfied, and if you feel offended, so be it. Fear of offending others is only fear of losing votes and of an uneasy relationship in work. Will I lose my rice-bowl if you don't vote for me? Nothing of the kind. Actually, if you speak your mind and lay the issues on the table sharply, you'll find it easier to get along with others. Don't draw in your horns. Why does an ox have two horns? They are for fighting, for self-defence and attack. I often ask comrades if they have "horns" on their heads. Comrades, touch and feel if you have

any. I can see some comrades have horns, some have horns but not very sharp ones, and others have no horns at all. In my opinion, it is better to have them, for that goes well with Marxism. One of the tenets of Marxism is criticism and self-criticism.

So to hold meetings at regular intervals for conducting criticism and self-criticism is a good measure for exercising mutual supervision among comrades and promoting the rapid progress of the cause of the Party and the state. I suggest that you comrades of the provincial and municipal Party committees think it over and see if you can do likewise. You want to follow the example of the Central Committee, don't you? I think on this score you can.

Finally, I call on you comrades here and all Party members:

Strive for the successful convocation of the Eighth National Congress of the Party in 1956!

Strive for the successful fulfilment of the First Five-Year Plan!

NOTES

¹ A Chinese mythological novel with the conflict between the ancient states of Shang and Chou as background.

IN REFUTATION OF “UNIFORMITY OF PUBLIC OPINION”

May 24, 1955

What Hu Feng calls “uniformity of public opinion” actually means that counter-revolutionaries are not allowed to express counter-revolutionary views. Indeed this is true, our system does deprive all counter-revolutionaries of freedom of speech and allows this freedom only among the people. We allow opinions to be varied among the people, that is, there is freedom to criticize, to express different views and to advocate theism or atheism (*i.e.*, materialism). In any society and at any time, there are always two kinds of people and views, the advanced and the backward, that exist as opposites struggling with each other, with the advanced views invariably prevailing over the backward ones; it is neither possible nor right to have “uniformity of public opinion”. Society can progress only if what is advanced is given full play and prevails over what is backward. But in an era in which classes and class struggle still exist both at home and abroad, the working class and the masses who have seized state power must suppress the resistance to the revolution put up by all counter-revolutionary classes, groups and individuals, thwart their activities aimed at restoration and prohibit them from exploiting freedom of speech for counter-revolutionary purposes. Thus Hu Feng and counter-revolutionaries of his kind find “uniformity of public opinion” inconvenient for them. Their inconvenience is exactly what we want and is exactly what is convenient for us. Public opinion in our country is at once uniform and non-uniform. Among the people, both the advanced and the backward are free to use our newspapers, periodicals, forums, etc. to compete with each other, so that the former can educate the latter by the democratic method of persuasion and backward ideas and systems can be overcome. When a contradic-

Article criticizing the counter-revolutionary Hu Feng clique.

tion is resolved, new contradictions emerge, and competition takes place again. In this way, society constantly progresses. The existence of contradictions means non-uniformity. The resolution of contradictions results in temporary uniformity, but new contradictions soon emerge, which means non-uniformity, and they, in turn, have to be resolved. As for the contradiction between the people and the counter-revolutionaries, that is a matter of dictatorship over the counter-revolutionaries by the people under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party. Here the dictatorial, not the democratic, method is used; in other words, the counter-revolutionaries must behave themselves and are not allowed to be unruly in word or deed. In this respect, it is not only public opinion that is uniform, but the law too. On this question, the arguments of Hu Feng and other counter-revolutionaries may seem plausible, and on hearing such counter-revolutionary remarks some muddleheads feel themselves somewhat in the wrong. Well, you see, "uniformity of public opinion", or "absence of public opinion", or "suppression of freedom" — don't they sound awful? These people cannot distinguish clearly between two different categories, between what is within the ranks of the people and what is without. Within the ranks of the people, it is criminal to suppress freedom, to suppress the people's criticism of the shortcomings and mistakes of the Party and the government or to suppress free discussion in academic circles. This is our system. However, all this is legitimate in capitalist countries. Outside the ranks of the people, it is criminal to allow counter-revolutionaries to be unruly in word or deed and it is legitimate to exercise dictatorship over them. This is our system. The opposite is true of capitalist countries, where the bourgeoisie exercises a dictatorship under which revolutionary people are not allowed to be "unruly in word or deed" but must "behave themselves". Exploiters and counter-revolutionaries are always and everywhere in the minority while the exploited and revolutionaries are invariably in the majority. Therefore, dictatorship by the latter is perfectly right, while dictatorship by the former is invariably wrong. Hu Feng also said, "The great majority of readers belong to some organization where the atmosphere is coercive." Among the people, we reject the coercive method of commandism and adhere to the democratic method of persuasion; here the atmosphere should be free, "coercion" is wrong. "The great majority of readers belong to some organization" — this is excellent. In thousands of years nothing like this had ever happened. It was only after the Communist

Party led the people in waging a long and arduous struggle that they were able to change to being united from being like loose sand, a condition which favoured the reactionaries' exploitation and oppression, and that the people achieved this great unity among themselves within a few years after victory in the revolution. By "coercion" Hu Feng means our coercing those on the side of counter-revolution. Yes, they tremble with fear, feeling "like the miserable daughter-in-law always afraid of being beaten", or worrying that "a mere cough is being recorded". We consider this excellent too. Nothing like this had ever happened in thousands of years either. Only after the Communist Party led the people through a long and arduous struggle were these scoundrels made to feel so uncomfortable. In a word, the day of joy for the people is a day of woe for the counter-revolutionaries. This, above all, is what we celebrate each year when National Day comes around. Hu Feng also said, "When it comes to literature and art, mechanism is really the easiest thing." Here "mechanism" is a derogatory term for dialectical materialism, and to call it "the easiest thing" is sheer nonsense. Idealism and metaphysics are the easiest things in the world, because, being neither based on objective reality nor submitted to its test, they permit people to talk as much nonsense as they like. Materialism and dialectics, on the other hand, demand effort. They must be based on and submitted to the test of objective reality. Unless one makes the effort, one is liable to drift into idealism and metaphysics. In his letter¹ Hu Feng raised three questions of principle, which we have deemed it necessary to repudiate at some length. In addition, Hu Feng wrote in the letter, "At present there is a desire to resist everywhere, there are further demands everywhere"; this was in 1950. At the time, the bulk of Chiang Kai-shek's military forces had just been wiped out on the mainland, many of the counter-revolutionary armed forces who had turned into bandits were yet to be eliminated, the large-scale movements of agrarian reform and suppression of counter-revolutionaries had not yet begun, nor had the work of readjustment in the fields of culture and education. What Hu Feng said did reflect the situation then, but he left something unsaid. To spell it out, it should have read: At present there is a desire on the part of counter-revolutionaries to resist the revolution everywhere, there are further demands of all sorts from counter-revolutionaries everywhere seeking to make trouble for the revolution.

NOTES

¹ This refers to a counter-revolutionary confidential letter Hu Feng wrote on August 13, 1950 to his follower Chang Chung-hsiao.

PREFACE AND EDITOR'S NOTES TO
*MATERIAL ON THE
COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY HU FENG CLIQUE*

May and June 1955

PREFACE

June 15, 1955

To meet the needs of the broad reading public, we have made a compilation of the material on the counter-revolutionary Hu Feng clique which appeared in three instalments in the *People's Daily* between May 13 and June 10, 1955 and also the *People's Daily* editorial of June 10, and are having it issued by the People's Publishing House under the title *Material on the Counter-Revolutionary Hu Feng Clique*. In this book we have also reprinted Hu Feng's "My Self-Criticism" as source material, but in an appendix coming after the material supplied by Shu Wu,¹ so that readers can study this double-dealing counter-revolutionary. We have made a few verbal changes in the editor's notes and the footnotes to the three instalments of the material. We have revised some footnotes, added others and inserted two more editor's notes in the second instalment. For the sake of consistency, the term "anti-Party clique" in the title of the first and second instalments has been changed to "counter-revolutionary clique", as in the third instalment. Otherwise, the text is unchanged.

It may be expected that, as with the publication of the material in the *People's Daily*, the publication of this book will attract the attention of two kinds of people. On the one hand, counter-revolutionaries will pay attention to it. On the other, the masses of the people will give it even more attention.

Counter-revolutionaries and those with certain counter-revolutionary sentiments will find that the correspondence of the Hu Feng

elements strikes a sympathetic chord. Hu Feng and his clique are indeed spokesmen for all counter-revolutionary classes, groups and individuals, and the curses they hurl at the revolution and the tactics they use in their activities will be appreciated by all those counter-revolutionaries who can get hold of this book, from which they can derive some counter-revolutionary education about class struggle. Nevertheless, this will in no way save them from their doom. Like all the counter-revolutionary writings of their backers, the imperialists and Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, which were directed against the Chinese people, these writings of the Hu Feng elements are records not of success but of failure. They did not save their own clique from destruction.

The masses of the people are very much in need of this material. How do counter-revolutionaries employ their double-dealing tactics? How do they succeed in deceiving us by their false appearances, while furtively doing the things we least expect? All this is a blank to thousands upon thousands of well-intentioned people. On this account, many counter-revolutionaries have wormed their way into our ranks. The eyes of our people are not keen, they are not adept at distinguishing good people from bad types. When people operate in normal conditions, we know how to tell the bad from the good, but we are not adept at seeing through those who operate in unusual conditions. The Hu Feng elements are counter-revolutionaries who put on a disguise to hide their true features and to give a false impression. But since they oppose the revolution, it is impossible for them to cover up their true features entirely. As for the leading spirits of the Hu Feng clique, they have had disputes with us on many occasions before and since liberation. They are different in word and deed not only from Communists but also from vast numbers of non-Party revolutionaries and democrats. They were recently exposed to the full simply because we got hold of a mass of solid evidence against them. As for many of the individuals in the Hu Feng clique, they were able to deceive us because our Party organizations, state organs, people's organizations, cultural and educational institutions or enterprises failed to make a strict examination of their records before admitting them. It was also because we were in a stormy period of revolution in the recent past and people of all sorts tried to get close to us as we emerged the victors; so inevitably the waters were muddied, the bad became mixed with the good, and we have not yet got around to sifting them thoroughly. Furthermore, success in spotting and clearing out bad elements depends on a

combination of correct guidance from the leading organs with a high degree of political consciousness on the part of the masses, but in this regard our work in the past was not without shortcomings. These are all lessons for us.

We attach importance to the Hu Feng case because we want to use it to educate the masses of the people, and first those cadres who can read and also the intellectuals; to them we recommend this *Material* for raising their level of political consciousness. The *Material* is striking for its extreme sharpness and clarity. Counter-revolutionaries will naturally pay attention to it and revolutionary people even more so. If the masses of the revolutionary people learn something from this case and this material and thereby increase their revolutionary ardour and their ability to discriminate, we shall have all sorts of hidden counter-revolutionaries gradually uncovered.

EDITOR'S NOTES (Selections)

May and June 1955

1

A faction — called “coterie” by our forefathers and “ring” or “outfit” by people today — is something quite familiar to us. To attain their political ends people who pursue factional activities often accuse others of being factional, and being factional, they say, is not upright; for themselves, they claim to be upright, and upright people just don't have anything to do with factions. Those who followed Hu Feng's lead were said to be “young writers” and “revolutionary writers” “hated” and “persecuted” by the Communist Party, the faction that had “bourgeois theories” and “formed an independent kingdom”; therefore, Hu Peng and company wanted revenge. The question of the *Literary Gazette*² was “merely a breach that has been seized upon” and was “by no means an isolated one”, it was most necessary to “extend and generalize” it and “show that the question was one of factionalist rule”, and “factionalist and warlord rule” at that. The matter was so serious that they “fired off” a lot of ammunition to mop us up. In so doing Hu Feng and company attracted attention. After careful investigation of many of these persons, this clique was found to be of some size.

Previously they were known as “a small group”. No, that’s not so, there are quite a few of them. Previously they were known simply as a group of men of letters. No, that’s not so, they have wormed their way into political, military, economic, cultural and educational departments. Previously, they seemed to be a group of revolutionaries operating in broad daylight. No, that’s not so, most of them have a very shady background. The main force of the clique consists of imperialist and Kuomintang secret agents, Trotskyites, reactionary army officers, or renegades from the Communist Party; with these persons serving as the backbone, a counter-revolutionary faction hidden in the revolutionary camp, an underground independent kingdom, was formed. This counter-revolutionary faction, this underground kingdom, has set itself the task of overthrowing the People’s Republic of China and restoring imperialist and Kuomintang rule. Whenever and wherever possible, they go nosing around for our shortcomings which they use as pretexts for sabotage. Wherever they have their men, strange things happen. After liberation, this counter-revolutionary clique expanded and, if unchecked, would go on expanding. Now that the truth about Hu Feng and company has come to light, many phenomena can be satisfactorily explained and their activities stopped.

2

Sure enough, Hu Feng subsequently acted on Lu Tien’s suggestion to use offensive tactics for defence. Thus he came to Peking to ask for a job, requested that his case be discussed, submitted the 300,000-word memo to the Central Committee, and finally seized upon the question of the *Literary Gazette* to open fire. Generally, when things are going badly for them, all kinds of representatives of the exploiting classes use offensive tactics as a means of defence in order to survive today and grow tomorrow. Rumours are fabricated out of thin air and lies told point-blank; certain superficial phenomena are seized on for attacking the essence of things; some people are lauded while others are condemned; and matters are distorted and exaggerated to “make a breakthrough at certain points” so as to put us in a difficult position. In short, they are assiduous in studying what tactics to use against us and “spying out the land” in order to attain their end. Sometimes they “play possum” and wait for a chance to “spring a counter-attack”. They have long years of experience in class struggle and are

skilful in different forms of struggle, legal and illegal. We revolutionaries must know their tricks and study their tactics in order to defeat them. Never be so bookish and naive as to treat complex class struggle as a simple matter.

3

It is conceit, self-complacency, lack of vigilance and absorption in the day-to-day job to the neglect of politics on our part as revolutionaries that have made it possible for many counter-revolutionaries to “penetrate” our “liver”. They are by no means confined to the men of the Hu Feng clique, many other secret agents and bad elements have also sneaked in.

4

When a Party member is criticized for his liberalistic tendencies, Hu Feng elements say he is “being attacked”. If his “fighting will is rather weak”, that is, if he does not cling to his liberalistic stand but is willing to accept Party criticism and come over to the correct stand, then he is not much of a hope to the Hu Feng clique and cannot be dragged away. On the contrary, if his “fighting will” to cling to his liberalistic stand is not “rather weak” but “rather strong”, he is in danger of being dragged away. Hu Feng elements are sure to “have a go” at it, and they are already calling him “comrade”. Shouldn’t this be taken as a warning? What then should be the attitude of a Party member when he is criticized for having made ideological and political mistakes? There is a choice of two courses before him: one is to correct his mistakes and be a good Party member, the other is to slide further down the path and even fall into the pit of counter-revolution. The second alternative really exists and counter-revolutionaries may be beckoning him on.

5

Just as we constantly appraise the balance of forces in the international and domestic class struggle, so does the enemy. But, being backward and decadent reactionaries, our enemies are doomed; they are ignorant of the laws of the objective world, are subjective and

metaphysical in their thinking, and thus are invariably wrong in their judgments. They are inexorably driven by their class instinct to believe that they are very superior and that the revolutionary forces can never amount to much. They invariably overestimate their own strength and underestimate ours. We have witnessed many counter-revolutionaries toppled one by one — the Ching Dynasty government, the Northern warlords, the Japanese militarists, Mussolini, Hitler and Chiang Kai-shek; they made mistakes in thought and deed and could not do otherwise. All contemporary imperialists are bound to repeat such mistakes. Isn't it ludicrous? According to the Hu Feng elements, the Chinese people's revolutionary forces led by the Communist Party are "doomed", and they are nothing but "the sere, the yellow leaf" and "a rotting corpse". And how about the counter-revolutionary forces represented by the Hu Feng elements? Although "some fragile sprouts may be smothered", large numbers of sprouts "are breaking through" and will "grow sturdily". If to this day Royalist representatives are found in the bourgeois French National Assembly, then it is highly probable that some representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek dynasty will remain active here and there years after the complete elimination of all exploiting classes from the face of the earth. The worst die-hards among them will never admit defeat. That's because they need to deceive themselves as well as others, or else they could not carry on.

6

In this letter, the phrase "those veiled feudal forces are madly killing people" indicates that the counter-revolutionary Hu Feng clique is terror-stricken by the great struggle of our people's revolutionary forces to suppress the counter-revolutionary forces, and this feeling is typical of all counter-revolutionary classes, groups and individuals. What strikes terror into their hearts is precisely what makes the revolutionary masses jubilant. "Unprecedented in history" — that's correct too. Except for the revolution which replaced the primitive communal system by the slave system, that is, a system of non-exploitation by one of exploitation, all revolutions in the past ended in the replacement of one system of exploitation by another, and it was neither imperative nor possible to do a thorough job of suppressing counter-revolutionaries. Only our revolution, the revolution of the

masses of the people led by the proletariat and the Communist Party aims at the final elimination of all systems of exploitation and all classes; therefore, the exploiting classes which are being eliminated are bound to come out and put up resistance through their counter-revolutionary political parties and groups or through certain individuals, and the masses of the people on their part must unite and suppress these forces of resistance resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely. Only at this time is such suppression imperative and possible. "The struggle has inevitably deepened" — this is quite correct, too. The expression "veiled feudal forces", however, is wrong; it is a derogatory expression for "the people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat and the Communist Party and based on the worker-peasant alliance", just as the word "mechanism" used by this clique is a derogatory term for "dialectical materialism".

7

Here again we come across this Chang Chung-hsiao. He has a pretty good counter-revolutionary nose and outmatches many in our revolutionary ranks, including a number of Communists, in level of class consciousness and keenness of political sense of smell. Compared with men of the Hu Feng clique, many of our own people are vastly inferior in these respects. We must study and heighten our class vigilance and make our political sense of smell keener. If there is anything positive the Hu Feng clique can offer, it is that through the present soul-stirring struggle we shall raise our own political consciousness and sensitivity much higher, firmly suppress all counter-revolutionaries and greatly strengthen our revolutionary dictatorship; we shall thus carry the revolution through to the end and achieve the objective of building a great socialist country.

NOTES

¹ This refers to "Some Material About the Counter-Revolutionary Hu Feng Clique" submitted by Shu Wu, a member of the clique. It contains excerpts from a number of counter-revolutionary confidential letters Hu Feng wrote to Shu Wu before and after liberation.

² From the end of October to the beginning of December 1954, the presidiums of the Federation of Literary and Art Circles of China and of the Union of Chinese Writers held enlarged joint meetings to examine the mistakes of the *Literary Gazette* in suppressing the criticism by young writers of the bourgeois ideas prevalent in studies of *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. Hu Feng believed his opportunity had come and began attacking the Communist Party. He said in a confidential letter to one of his followers, "This is merely a breach that has been seized upon, and it is most necessary to extend and generalize the matter."

ON THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE

July 31, 1955

I

An upsurge in the new, socialist mass movement is imminent throughout the countryside. But some of our comrades, tottering along like a woman with bound feet, are complaining all the time, "You're going too fast, much too fast." Too much carping, unwarranted complaints, boundless anxiety and countless taboos — all this they take as the right policy to guide the socialist mass movement in the rural areas.

No, this is not the right policy, it is the wrong one.

The high tide of social transformation in the countryside, the high tide of co-operation, has already swept a number of places and will soon sweep the whole country. It is a vast socialist revolutionary movement involving a rural population of more than 500 million, and it has tremendous, world-wide, significance. We should give this movement active, enthusiastic and systematic leadership, we should not drag it back by whatever means. Some errors are unavoidable in the process, which is understandable, and they will not be hard to correct. Shortcomings or mistakes among cadres and peasants can be remedied or overcome provided we actively help them. The cadres and the peasants are advancing under the leadership of the Party and, fundamentally, the movement is healthy. In some places they have made certain mistakes in their work; for example, poor peasants have been barred from the co-operatives in disregard of their difficulties, while well-to-do middle

Report at a conference of secretaries of provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees called by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

peasants have been forced into the co-operatives in violation of their interests. These mistakes should be corrected by educating the cadres and peasants and not by simply dressing them down. Blunt reprimands solve no problem. We must guide the movement boldly and must not "fear dragons ahead and tigers behind". Both cadres and peasants will remould themselves in the course of the struggles they themselves experience. Let them go into action and let them learn and become more competent as they go along. In this way many fine people will come to the fore. "Fearing dragons ahead and tigers behind" will not produce cadres. Large groups of cadres with short-term training should be sent to the countryside from above to guide and assist the co-operative movement, but they must also take part in the movement itself if they are to learn how to work. One does not necessarily learn how to do a job just by listening to a lecturer explain a few dozen points in a training class.

In short, the leadership should never lag behind the mass movement. Yet, as things stand now, it is the mass movement which is running ahead, while the leadership cannot keep pace with it. This state of affairs must change.

II

The nation-wide co-operative movement is now taking tremendous strides forward, and yet we still have to argue such questions as: Can the co-operatives grow? Can they be consolidated? As far as certain comrades are concerned, the crux of the matter seems to be their worry as to whether it is possible to consolidate the several hundred thousand existing semi-socialist co-operatives, which are generally rather small, averaging twenty-odd peasant households each. Of course, unless they can be consolidated, growth is out of the question. Certain comrades remain unconvinced despite the record of the growth of co-operation in the last few years and want to wait and see how things shape up in 1955. They may even want to wait and see for another year, and only if more co-operatives are consolidated by the end of 1956 will they be truly convinced that the co-operative transformation of agriculture is possible and that the policy of the Central Committee of our Party is correct. That is why the work in these two years is crucial.

In order to show the feasibility of agricultural co-operation and the soundness of the Party Central Committee's policy on this matter, it is perhaps not without some value for us to review the history of the agricultural co-operative movement in our country.

In the twenty-two years of revolutionary wars preceding the founding of the People's Republic of China, our Party had already acquired experience in guiding the peasants, after agrarian reform, to set up agricultural producers' mutual-aid organizations containing certain rudiments of socialism. In those days, there were mutual-aid working groups and ploughing teams in Kiangsi Province, labour-exchange teams in northern Shensi and mutual-aid teams in northern, eastern and northeastern China. In isolated cases, agricultural producers' co-operatives of a semi-socialist or socialist nature also came into being. For instance, during the War of Resistance Against Japan an agricultural producers' co-operative of a socialist nature appeared in Ansai County in northern Shensi. But such co-operatives were not widely promoted then.

It was after the founding of the People's Republic of China that our Party led the peasants in setting up agricultural producers' mutual-aid teams more extensively and in initiating the formation of large numbers of agricultural producers' co-operatives on the basis of these teams. By now nearly six years more have been spent on this work.

By December 15, 1951, when the Central Committee of our Party adopted the first Draft Resolution on Mutual Aid and Co-operation in Agricultural Production and issued it to local Party organizations to be tried out, there were already three hundred or more agricultural producers' co-operatives. (The document was not published in the press as a formal Party resolution till March 1953.) Two years later, when our Central Committee issued its Resolution on Agricultural Producers' Co-operatives on December 16, 1953, the number had grown to more than 14,000, a 46-fold increase in the space of two years.

This resolution called for an increase of agricultural producers' co-operatives from 14,000 odd to 35,800 between the winter of 1953 and the autumn harvest of 1954, that is, an increase of merely 150 per cent. As it turned out, during the year the number actually rose to 100,000, or an increase of more than 600 per cent.

In October 1954 the Central Committee of our Party decided on an increase of 500 per cent, from 100,000 to 600,000. Actually, the number reached 670,000. By June 1955, after a preliminary readjustment, it was

cut by 20,000, leaving 650,000, or 50,000 more than the planned target. The number of peasant households in the co-operatives was 16,900,000, or an average of 26 households in each.

These co-operatives are to be found mainly in the northern provinces, which were liberated earlier. As for the other provinces liberated later, which constitute the majority, each has a number of agricultural producers' co-operatives, but with the exception of Anhwei and Chekiang, they do not have many yet.

These co-operatives are generally small, but a few are large, some with 70 to 80 households, some with over 100, and some with several hundred.

They are mostly semi-socialist, but a few have developed into higher-stage co-operatives of a socialist nature.

Along with the growth of the peasants' co-operative movement in agricultural production, a small number of socialist state farms have been established in our country. By 1957 we shall have 3,038 state farms cultivating 16,870,000 *mou* of land. Of these, 141 will be mechanized farms (counting both those existing in 1952 and those to be set up in the course of the First Five-Year Plan) with 7,580,000 *mou* under cultivation, and 2,897 will be non-mechanized state farms under local administration, cultivating 9,290,000 *mou*. There will be a big growth in state-operated agriculture during the period covered by the Second and Third Five-Year Plans.

In the spring of 1955 the Central Committee of our Party decided that the number of agricultural producers' co-operatives should grow to a million. This means an increase of only 350,000 over the existing 650,000, or a little more than 50 per cent. It seems to me this may be a bit too small. Probably the figure of 650,000 ought to be roughly doubled, that is, to rise to something like 1,300,000, so that, except in some of the border areas, there will be one or more small agricultural producers' co-operatives of a semi-socialist nature to serve as models in each of the country's 200,000-odd townships. In a year or two these co-operatives will gain experience and become old ones, and people will learn from them. There are still fourteen months to go between now and the autumn harvest of October 1956, and it should be possible to accomplish this plan for establishing co-operatives. I hope that on their return the responsible comrades of the various provinces and autonomous regions will look into the matter, work out appropriate plans in accordance with the concrete conditions and report to the Central Committee within two

months. We shall then discuss the matter again and make a final decision.

The question is whether the co-operatives can be consolidated. Some people say that last year's plan to set up 500,000 was too big and too rash and so is this year's plan to set up another 350,000. They doubt that so many co-operatives, once formed, can be consolidated.

Is it possible to consolidate them?

True, neither socialist industrialization nor socialist transformation is easy. To change some 110 million peasant households from individual farming to collective farming and then to accomplish the technical transformation of agriculture certainly involves a host of difficulties. But we should be confident of our Party's ability to lead the masses in overcoming them.

On the question of agricultural co-operation, I think we should be confident, firstly, that both the poor peasants and the lower-middle peasants among the new and old middle peasants¹ are enthusiastic about taking the socialist road and are eagerly responding to our Party's call for co-operative transformation — this being particularly the case among those with a higher level of political consciousness — because the poor peasants are in a difficult economic position and because the lower-middle peasants are still not well off, although their economic position is better than before liberation.

I think we should be confident, secondly, that the Party is capable of leading the people of the whole country to socialism. Having led the great people's democratic revolution to victory and established the people's democratic dictatorship headed by the working class, our Party can certainly lead the whole nation in basically accomplishing socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce in the course of roughly three five-year plans. In agriculture no less than in other spheres we already have powerful and convincing proof of this. Witness the first batch of 300 co-operatives, the second of 13,700 and the third of 86,000, or a total of 100,000, all established before the autumn of 1954 and all consolidated since. Why, then, can't the fourth batch of 550,000 co-operatives formed in 1954-55 and the fifth batch to be established in 1955-56 (the provisional control figure is 350,000, subject to final confirmation) also be consolidated?

We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these principles, we shall accomplish nothing.

III

To achieve co-operation step by step throughout our rural areas, we must conscientiously check up on and strengthen the co-operatives already in existence.

We must put emphasis on the quality of the co-operatives and oppose any tendency to concentrate solely on increasing their number and membership to the neglect of their quality. We must therefore give serious attention to the work of checking up on the co-operatives.

This check-up should be done not just once, but two or three times, a year. A certain number of co-operatives have had one in the first half of this year (in certain places, apparently, a very slipshod one, done without serious effort). I suggest a second check-up for these co-operatives in the autumn and winter of this year, and a third in the spring and summer of next. Of the 650,000 existing co-operatives, 550,000 are new, having been set up last winter or this spring, and they include a number of Class I co-operatives² which are more or less consolidated. If the 100,000 old and consolidated co-operatives are added, the number now consolidated is by no means small. Can these co-operatives help to bring about the gradual consolidation of the others? The answer should certainly be yes.

We should treasure every spark of socialist enthusiasm shown by the peasants and cadres, and not thwart such enthusiasm. We should identify ourselves heart and soul with the members and cadres of the co-operatives and with the county, district and township cadres, and not thwart their enthusiasm.

No decision should be made to dissolve co-operatives unless all, or nearly all, their members are determined not to carry on. If some members are determined to give up, let them withdraw while the majority stays in and carries on. If the majority is firmly against carrying on but the minority is willing to do so, let the majority withdraw while the minority stays in and continues. Even if things come to such a pass, it will be all right. In one very small co-operative of only six households in Hopei Province, the three old middle peasant households firmly refused to carry on and were allowed to withdraw, but the three poor peasant households³ said they would continue whatever happened. They did and the co-operative was preserved. As a matter of fact, the direction taken by these three poor peasant households is the direction the 500 million peasants of the country will take. All peasants now

farming individually will eventually take the road resolutely chosen by these three poor peasant households.

With the adoption of a policy that was called “resolute contraction” in Chekiang (not by decision of the Chekiang Provincial Party Committee), out of the 53,000 co-operatives in the province 15,000 (comprising 400,000 peasant households) were dissolved at a single stroke. This caused great dissatisfaction among the masses and the cadres, and it was altogether the wrong thing to do. This policy of “resolute contraction” was decided on in a state of panic. To take such a major step without the approval of the Central Committee was wrong too. Moreover, in April 1955 the Central Committee had already issued a warning: “Do not repeat the mistake of mass dissolution of co-operatives made in 1953, or otherwise you will again have to make a self-criticism.” And yet certain comrades preferred not to heed this warning.

It seems to me that there are two tendencies in the face of success, both undesirable. One is to become dizzy with success, which leads to swelled heads and “Left” deviationist mistakes. Of course, that’s bad. The second is to be scared of success, which leads to “resolute contraction” and Right deviationist mistakes. That’s just as bad. The trouble now is of the latter kind, for some comrades have become scared of the several hundred thousand small co-operatives.

IV

Before co-operatives are set up, preparatory work must be done seriously and well.

We must pay attention to quality from the very start and oppose the tendency to go after quantity alone.

Fight no battle unprepared, fight no battle you are not sure of winning. This was the celebrated slogan of our Party during the revolutionary wars. It can be applied to the work of building socialism as well. To be sure of success, one must be prepared, and what is more, fully prepared. A great deal of preparatory work is necessary before a new batch of agricultural producers’ co-operatives can be set up in a province, prefecture or county. In the main, this work should consist of the following:

- (1) Criticize wrong ideas and sum up the experience gained in past work.

(2) Conduct propaganda systematically and repeatedly among the peasant masses concerning our Party's principles, policies and measures on agricultural co-operation. In so doing, we should not only explain the advantages of co-operative transformation, we should also point out the difficulties which will be encountered on the way, so that the peasants may be mentally well prepared.

(3) Draw up a comprehensive plan for expanding agricultural co-operation in the entire province, prefecture, county, district or township in the light of actual conditions and work out an annual plan accordingly.

(4) Train cadres for the setting up of co-operatives in short-term courses.

(5) Develop agricultural producers' mutual-aid teams on a wide scale and in large numbers and, whenever possible, get these teams to join together and form combined mutual-aid teams, thus laying the foundation for further combination into co-operatives.

If all this is done, it will be possible basically to solve the problem of the unity of quantity and quality in the development of co-operatives. But it will still be necessary to follow through with an immediate check-up after each batch of co-operatives is formed.

Whether or not a batch of co-operatives, once formed, can be consolidated depends, firstly, on how well the preparatory work is done and, secondly, on how well the check-up is carried out afterwards.

In the work of establishing and checking up on the co-operatives reliance must be placed on the Party and Youth League branches in the township. For this reason, both tasks must be closely linked with building and consolidating the Party and Youth League organizations in the rural areas.

Whether in establishing co-operatives or in checking up on them, the local cadres in the rural areas should be the main force, and they should be encouraged and asked to take responsibility, while cadres sent from above should be the auxiliary force, whose function is to guide and help and not to take everything into their own hands.

V

In production the agricultural producers' co-operatives must achieve higher crop yields than the individual peasants and mutual-aid

teams. Output must not remain at the individual peasant or mutual-aid team level, for that would mean failure; what point, then, in having co-operatives at all? Still less can yields be allowed to fall. Over 80 per cent of the 650,000 agricultural producers' co-operatives which have already been set up have increased their crop yields. This is very good, showing that the members are very keen on production and that co-operatives are superior to mutual-aid teams and far superior to individual farming.

To increase crop yields it is necessary:

- (1) to adhere to the principles of voluntary participation and mutual benefit;
- (2) to improve management (planning and administration of production, organization of labour, etc.);
- (3) to improve farming techniques (deep ploughing and intensive cultivation, close planting in small clusters, extending the area of double or triple cropping, introduction of better strains of seed, popularization of new types of farm implements, the fight against plant diseases and insect pests, etc.); and
- (4) to increase the means of production (land under cultivation, fertilizer, water conservancy works, draught animals, farm implements, etc.).

These are indispensable conditions for consolidating the co-operatives and ensuring increased production.

In adhering to the principles of voluntary participation and mutual benefit, we must at present give our attention to the following problems:

- (1) Whether or not it is better to delay for a year or two the turning in of draught animals and larger farm implements as shares in the co-operative, and whether or not the prices fixed are fair and the payments to the owners are spread over too long a time.
- (2) Whether or not there is a proper ratio between the payment based on land shares and the payment for labour.
- (3) How the co-operative should raise the funds it needs.
- (4) Whether or not certain members may devote part of their labour to certain kinds of side-line production.

(Since the agricultural producers' co-operatives we are now setting up are generally still semi-socialist in nature, care must be taken to solve these four problems properly so as not to violate the principle of mutual benefit as between the poor and the middle

peasants, without which there can be no basis for voluntary participation.)

(5) How much land should be set aside for members to cultivate for their personal needs.

(6) The question of the class composition of the co-operative membership.

And so on.

Here I would like to deal with the question of the class composition of the co-operative membership. I think that, in the next year or two, wherever the movement for co-operation has just begun to spread or has only recently spread, as in most areas at present, we should first get the active elements of the following sections of the people to organize themselves: (1) the poor peasants, (2) the lower-middle peasants among the new middle peasants, and (3) the lower-middle peasants among the old middle peasants. However, those among them who are not enthusiastic for the time being should not be dragged in against their will. They can be drawn into the co-operatives batch by batch when their political consciousness has risen and they have become interested in co-operatives. These sections are more or less similar in their economic status. Either they are still leading a hard life (to wit, the poor peasants, who, though they have received land and are much better off than in pre-liberation days, are still in difficulty for lack of manpower, draught animals and farm implements), or they are still not well off (to wit, the lower-middle peasants). Therefore, they are all enthusiastic about forming co-operatives. Nevertheless, for one reason or another, their enthusiasm varies in degree — some are very keen, some are not so keen for the time being, and others prefer to wait and see. Therefore, we should devote a period of time to educating all those who do not want to join co-operatives yet, even though they are poor or lower-middle peasants, we should patiently wait until they are politically more conscious, and we must not violate the voluntary principle by dragging them in against their will.

As for the new and old upper-middle peasants, that is, the middle peasants who are economically better off, with the exception of those who are politically conscious enough to take the socialist road and are really willing to join, they should not be admitted into the co-operatives for the time being, still less be dragged in against their will. The reason is that they are not yet politically conscious enough to take the socialist road; they will make up their minds to join the co-operatives only after

the majority in the rural areas have joined, or when yields per *mou* of the co-operatives equal or even surpass theirs and they realize that it is to their disadvantage in every respect to continue working on their own, and that they cannot further their interests except by joining.

So the first thing to do is to group the people who are poor or not well off according to their level of political consciousness (together they form about 60 to 70 per cent of the rural population) and get them to organize co-operatives in batches in the next few years, and only then should the well-to-do middle peasants be drawn in. In this way we will avoid commandism.

For the next few years in all areas where co-operative transformation has not been basically completed, landlords and rich peasants must definitely not be admitted into the co-operatives. In areas where it has been basically completed, however, the consolidated co-operatives may, on certain conditions, admit by stages and in groups former landlords and rich peasants who have long since given up exploitation, who engage in labour and are law-abiding, and may allow them to take part in collective labour while continuing to reform them through labour.

VI

As for the development of the co-operatives, the problem now is not one of having to criticize rash advance. It is wrong to say that the present development of the co-operatives has "gone beyond the real possibilities" or "gone beyond the level of political consciousness of the masses". This is how things stand: China has an enormous population with insufficient cultivated land (only three *mou* per head, taking the country as a whole, and one *mou* or even less on the average in many parts of the southern provinces), natural calamities are frequent (every year large areas of farmland suffer from flood, drought, gales, frost, hail or insect pests in varying degrees), and farming methods are backward. Consequently, although the life of the peasant masses has improved since the agrarian reform or even improved a good deal, many are still in difficulty or not well off and those who are well off are relatively few, and hence most of the peasants are enthusiastic about the socialist road. Their enthusiasm is being constantly heightened by China's socialist industrialization and its achievements. For them socialism is the only way out. These peasants make up 60 to 70 per cent

of the entire rural population. In other words, the only way for the majority of the peasants to shake off poverty, improve their livelihood and fight natural calamities is to unite and go forward along the high road of socialism. This awareness is growing rapidly among the masses of the poor peasants and of those who are not well off. The well-to-do or fairly well-to-do peasants, who make up only 20 to 30 per cent of the rural population, are vacillating, with some trying hard to go the capitalist way. As I have already said, there are also many among the poor peasants and those not well off who take a wait-and-see attitude for the time being because of their low political consciousness, and they too are wavering; however, it is easier for them than for the well-to-do peasants to accept socialism. That is how things really stand. But some of our comrades ignore these facts and think that the several hundred thousand newly established small semi-socialist agricultural producers' co-operatives have "gone beyond the real possibilities" or "gone beyond the level of political consciousness of the masses". This shows that their eyes are on the comparatively small number of well-to-do peasants to the neglect of the great majority, the poor peasants and those not well off. This is one kind of wrong thinking.

Furthermore, these comrades underrate the strength of the Communist Party's leadership in the countryside and the peasant masses' whole-hearted support for the Party. They believe it is difficult enough as it is for the Party to consolidate the several hundred thousand small co-operatives already in existence and therefore a large-scale expansion is simply inconceivable. They pessimistically picture the Party's present work in leading agricultural co-operation as having "gone beyond the level of the cadres' experience". True, the socialist revolution is a revolution of a new kind. Previously, our experience was confined to the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and we had no experience in socialist revolution. Yet how can we gain such experience? By sitting back and waiting for it? Or by plunging into the struggles of the socialist revolution and learning in the process? How can we gain experience in industrialization without carrying out the Five-Year Plan, or without pushing ahead with the work of socialist industrialization? One section of the Five-Year Plan deals with agricultural co-operation. If we do not lead the peasants in organizing one or more agricultural producers' co-operatives in every township or village, where will "the level of the cadres' experience" come from, and how will it rise? Clearly, the idea that the present development of the agricultural producers'

co-operatives has “gone beyond the level of the cadres’ experience” is mistaken. This is another kind of wrong thinking.

The way these comrades look at problems is wrong. They do not look at the essential or main aspects but emphasize the non-essential or minor ones. It should be pointed out that these non-essential or minor aspects must not be overlooked and must be dealt with one by one. But they should not be taken as the essential or main aspects, or we will lose our bearings.

We must have faith, first, that the peasant masses are willing to take the road of socialism step by step under the leadership of the Party and, second, that the Party is capable of leading the peasants onto this road. These two points are the essence of the matter, the main current. If we lack this conviction, it will be impossible for us basically to accomplish the building of socialism within roughly three five-year plans.

VII

The great historical experience of the Soviet Union in building socialism inspires our people with full confidence in the building of socialism in China. However, even on this subject of international experience there are different views. Some comrades disapprove of our Central Committee’s policy of keeping the development of agricultural co-operation in step with our socialist industrialization, although the validity of such a policy has been borne out in the Soviet Union. While conceding that the speed of industrialization as set at present is all right, they maintain that agricultural co-operation should proceed at an extremely slow pace and need not keep in step. This is to disregard the experience of the Soviet Union. These comrades fail to understand that socialist industrialization cannot be carried out in isolation from the co-operative transformation of agriculture. In the first place, as everyone knows, China’s current level of production of commodity grain and raw materials for industry is low, whereas the state’s need for them is growing year by year, and this presents a sharp contradiction. If we cannot basically solve the problem of agricultural co-operation within roughly three five-year plans, that is to say, if our agriculture cannot make a leap from small-scale farming with animal-drawn farm implements to large-scale mechanized farming, along with extensive

state-organized land reclamation by settlers using machinery (the plan being to bring 400 to 500 million *mou* of waste land under cultivation in the course of three five-year plans), then we shall fail to resolve the contradiction between the ever-increasing need for commodity grain and industrial raw materials and the present generally low output of staple crops, and we shall run into formidable difficulties in our socialist industrialization and be unable to complete it. The Soviet Union, which had to face the same problem in the course of building socialism, solved it by leading and developing the collectivization of agriculture in a planned way. And we can solve ours only by the same method. In the second place, some of our comrades have not given any thought to the connection between the following two facts, namely, that heavy industry, the most important branch of socialist industrialization, produces for agricultural use tractors and other farm machinery, chemical fertilizers, modern means of transport, oil, electric power, etc., and that all these things can be used, or used extensively, only on the basis of an agriculture where large-scale co-operative farming prevails. We are now carrying out a revolution not only in the social system, the change from private to public ownership, but also in technology, the change from handicraft to large-scale modern machine production, and the two revolutions are interconnected. In agriculture, with conditions as they are in our country, co-operation must precede the use of big machinery (in capitalist countries agriculture develops capitalistically). Therefore we must on no account regard industry and agriculture, socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture as disconnected or isolated things, and on no account must we emphasize the one and play down the other. In this matter too, Soviet experience points the way, yet some of our comrades pay no attention and always see these questions as isolated and unconnected. In the third place, some of our comrades have also failed to give any thought to the connection between two other facts, namely, that large funds are needed to accomplish both national industrialization and the technical transformation of agriculture, and that a considerable part of these funds has to be accumulated through agriculture. Apart from the direct agricultural tax, this is done by developing light industry to produce the great quantities of consumer goods needed by the peasants and exchanging them for the peasants' commodity grain and the raw materials for light industry, so that the material requirements of both the peasants and the state are met and funds are accumulated for the state. Moreover, large-scale expansion of light industry requires the

development of agriculture as well as of heavy industry. For it cannot be brought about on the basis of a small peasant economy; it has to await large-scale farming, which in our country means socialist co-operative agriculture. Only this type of agriculture can give the peasants far greater purchasing power than they now possess. Here again the Soviet Union has provided us with experience, but some of our comrades take no notice of it. Taking the stand of the bourgeoisie, the rich peasants, or the well-to-do middle peasants with their spontaneous tendencies towards capitalism, they always think in terms of the interests of the few and fail to take the working-class stand and think in terms of the interests of the whole country and people.

VIII

Then again, some comrades have dug up an argument of a sort from the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against what they call impetuosity and rashness in our present work of agricultural co-operation in China. Does not the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course* tell us that at a certain period many local Party organizations in the Soviet Union committed the error of impetuosity and rashness on the question of the pace of collectivization? Should we not take note of this international experience?

I think we should take note of this Soviet experience and must oppose any impetuous and rash thinking which ignores preparatory work and disregards the level of political consciousness of the peasant masses, but on no account should we allow these comrades to use the Soviet experience as a cover for their idea of moving at a snail's pace.

How has the Central Committee of our Party decided to carry through agricultural co-operation in China?

First, it intends to accomplish the plan, in the main, in eighteen years. The period of a little over three years from the founding of the People's Republic of China in October 1949 to 1952 was spent on rehabilitating the national economy. In the sphere of agriculture, in addition to agrarian reform and the restoration of production, during this period we greatly extended the organization of agricultural producers' mutual-aid teams in all the old liberated areas, where we also began to form semi-socialist agricultural producers' co-operatives and

gained some experience. Next followed the First Five-Year Plan, which began in 1953; nearly three years have elapsed since then, during which our agricultural co-operative movement has been spreading all over the country and our experience growing. The period from the founding of the People's Republic of China to the end of the Third Five-Year Plan covers eighteen years. In that period, we intend basically to accomplish the socialist transformation of agriculture together with socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. Is this possible? Soviet experience tells us that it is entirely possible. In the Soviet Union the Civil War ended in 1920 and the collectivization of agriculture was completed in the seventeen years from 1921 to 1937, the main part of this work being done in the six years from 1929 to 1934. Although, as the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course* records, some local Party organizations in the Soviet Union became "dizzy with success" during this period, the error was quickly corrected. Eventually, by a great effort the Soviet Union successfully accomplished the socialist transformation of the whole of its agriculture and at the same time achieved a massive technical reconstruction of agriculture. This road traversed by the Soviet Union is our model.

Secondly, the method we are using in the socialist transformation of agriculture is one of step-by-step advance. The first step was to call on the peasants, in accordance with the principles of voluntary participation and mutual benefit, to organize agricultural producers' mutual-aid teams, which had only certain rudiments of socialism and comprised only a few to a dozen or so households each. The second step has been to call on the peasants, likewise in accordance with the principles of voluntary participation and mutual benefit, to organize small agricultural producers' co-operatives on the basis of these mutual-aid teams, co-operatives which are semi-socialist in nature and are characterized by the pooling of land as shares and by unified management. Then the third step will be to call on the peasants, in accordance with the same principles, to combine further on the basis of these small semi-socialist co-operatives and organize large fully socialist agricultural producers' co-operatives. These steps make it possible for the peasants gradually to raise their socialist consciousness through personal experience and gradually to change their mode of life, thus lessening the feeling of abrupt change. Generally, these steps can avoid a fall in crop production during, say, the first year or two; indeed, they must ensure an increase each year, and this can be done. More than

80 per cent of the existing 650,000 agricultural producers' co-operatives have increased their output, while over 10 per cent have broken even, and less than 10 per cent have shown a decrease. In the two latter categories the state of affairs is bad, particularly in the case of the last category where production has fallen, and a great effort must be made to check up on and strengthen these co-operatives. Since more than 80 per cent of all the co-operatives have increased their output (by anything from 10 to 30 per cent), since over 10 per cent have shown neither an increase nor a decrease in their first year but may show an increase in their second year after having had a check-up, and since the less than 10 per cent registering a fall in output may also show an increase in their second year or at least break even after the check-up, it can be said that on the whole our progress in co-operation is healthy and that generally we can ensure increased production and avoid falling output. Moreover, these steps are a splendid course for training cadres. In this way administrative and technical personnel for the co-operatives can be gradually trained in large numbers.

Thirdly, a control figure for the extension of agricultural co-operation should be fixed once a year in the light of the actual situation, while during the year there should be several inspections of how the work of co-operation is being carried out. Concrete measures for extending co-operation in each province, county and township can thus be decided upon every year according to changing conditions and the degree of success in the work. Expansion may be halted for a while in some places in order to carry out a check-up; in others, expansion and check-up can proceed simultaneously. In certain co-operatives some of the members may be allowed to withdraw, and in individual cases a co-operative may even be allowed to dissolve temporarily. In some places new co-operatives should be set up in large numbers, while in others there should be no increase except in the number of peasant households in the existing co-operatives. In every province or county, whenever a batch of co-operatives is established, expansion must be halted to allow time for a check-up before setting up a new batch. The idea of never allowing any pause, any intermission, is wrong. As for the inspection of the progress of the co-operative movement, the Central Committee and the provincial, autonomous region, municipal and prefectural committees of the Party must take it firmly in hand and make sure that it is done not once but several times every year. Whenever a problem crops up, tackle it right away; don't let problems pile up and then try to settle them all at one go. Make criticism in good time; don't

get into the habit of criticizing only after the event. In the first seven months of this year, for instance, the Central Committee alone has called three conferences, including the present one, of leading comrades from various parts of the country to discuss the question of rural co-operation. This method of suiting our measures to local conditions and of giving timely guidance ensures that fewer mistakes will be made in our work and that those made will be quickly put right.

Taking all the above into consideration, can't we say that the guiding policy of the Central Committee of our Party on agricultural co-operation is the right one and therefore guarantees the healthy development of the movement? I think we can and should say so; to evaluate this policy as "rash advance" is utterly wrong.

IX

Some comrades take a wrong approach to the vital question of the worker-peasant alliance, proceeding as they do from the stand of the bourgeoisie, the rich peasants, or the well-to-do middle peasants with their spontaneous tendencies towards capitalism. They think that the present situation in the co-operative movement is very dangerous, and they advise us to "get off the horse quickly" in our present advance along the road of co-operation. "If you don't," they warn us, "there will be the danger of breaking up the worker-peasant alliance." We think exactly the opposite is true. There will be the danger of breaking up the worker-peasant alliance, if you don't get on the horse quickly. There is a difference of only a single word here — one says "off" while the other says "on" — yet it demonstrates the difference between the two lines. As everybody knows, we already have a worker-peasant alliance built on the basis of the bourgeois-democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism, a revolution which took the land from the landlords and distributed it to the peasants in order to free them from the bondage of feudal ownership. But this revolution is over, and feudal ownership has been abolished. What exists in the countryside today is capitalist ownership by the rich peasants and a vast sea of ownership by individual peasants. As is clear to everyone, the spontaneous forces of capitalism have been steadily growing in the countryside in recent years, with new rich peasants springing up everywhere and many well-to-do middle peasants striving to become

rich peasants. On the other hand, many poor peasants are still living in poverty for shortage of the means of production, with some getting into debt and others selling or renting out their land. If this tendency goes unchecked, it is inevitable that polarization in the countryside will get worse day by day. Those peasants who lose their land and those who remain in poverty will complain that we are doing nothing to save them from ruin or to help them out of their difficulties. Nor will the well-to-do middle peasants who are heading in the capitalist direction be pleased with us, for we shall never be able to satisfy their demands unless we intend to take the capitalist road. Can the worker-peasant alliance continue to hold firm in these circumstances? Obviously not. There is no solution to this problem except on a new basis. And that means to bring about, step by step, the socialist transformation of the whole of agriculture together with socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce; in other words, it means to carry out co-operation and eliminate the rich peasant economy and the individual economy in the countryside so that all the rural people will become increasingly well off together. We maintain that this is the only way to consolidate the worker-peasant alliance. Otherwise, this alliance will be in real danger of breaking up. The comrades who advise us to “get off the horse” are completely wrong in their thinking on this question.

COMMERCIAL XI

We must now realize that there will soon be a nation-wide high tide of socialist transformation in the countryside. This is inevitable. By the spring of 1958, at the end of the final year of the First Five-Year Plan and the beginning of the first year of the Second Five-Year Plan, co-operatives of a semi-socialist nature will embrace some 250 million people, about 55 million peasant households (averaging four and a half persons each), which will mean half the rural population. By that time many counties and some provinces will have basically completed the semi-socialist transformation of the agricultural economy, and in every part of the country a small number of semi-socialist co-operatives will have become fully socialist. By 1960, that is, during the first half of the Second Five-Year Plan, we shall in the main have achieved the semi-

socialist transformation of the remainder of the agricultural economy involving the other half of the rural population. By then the number of fully socialist co-operatives developed from the semi-socialist ones will have increased. All through the First and Second Five-Year Plans, the transformation of the countryside will continue to be primarily social, and only secondarily technical, the number of big farm machines will certainly increase, but not to any great extent. During the Third Five-Year Plan, the social and the technical transformation of the rural areas will proceed simultaneously; more big farm machinery will be employed each year, while in the field of social transformation, from 1960 on the semi-socialist co-operatives will be gradually developing into fully socialist ones, batch by batch and stage by stage. The social and economic features of China will not be completely changed until the socialist transformation of the social and economic system is completely accomplished and, in the technical field, machinery is used in all possible branches and places. The country's economic conditions being what they are, the technical transformation will take longer than the social. It is estimated that the basic completion of the nation-wide technical transformation of agriculture will take roughly four or five five-year plans, that is, twenty to twenty-five years. The whole Party must fight for the fulfilment of this great task.

XI

There must be comprehensive planning and more effective leadership.

There must be national, provincial, prefectural, county, district and township plans for the stage-by-stage development of co-operation. And as the work proceeds, these plans must constantly be revised in the light of the actual conditions. All Party and Youth League organizations at the provincial, prefectural, county, district and township levels must pay serious attention to rural problems and earnestly improve their leadership in rural work. The leading comrades in charge of local Party and Youth League committees at various levels should apply themselves to studying the work of agricultural co-operation and become expert at it. In short, they must not remain passive but take the initiative, not abandon leadership but strengthen it.

XII

In August 1954 (this, of course, is no longer news), the Heilungkiang Provincial Committee of the Communist Party of China reported:

With the rise and spread of rural co-operation, mutual-aid and co-operative organizations of various types and the people of various strata in the rural areas are all on the move to a greater or lesser degree. The existing agricultural producers' co-operatives are planning and preparing to enlarge their membership, and the agricultural producers' mutual-aid teams which are scheduled to become co-operatives are planning and preparing to draw in more households, while those which have not yet reached that level are anxious to go forward and reach a higher stage. Some people are busy preparing to join new co-operatives, others to join existing ones. Those not ready to join co-operatives this year are actively considering joining mutual-aid teams. The stir is very broad in scope. A mass movement has come into being. This is a new and striking feature in the great development of agricultural co-operation. But because some of the leading comrades in certain counties and districts have not kept abreast of this new feature and have not given more effective leadership in good time, certain unhealthy phenomena have begun to appear in a number of *tsun* and *tun*. [N.B. In Heilungkiang Province the *tsun* is the administrative unit corresponding to the township in the provinces south of the Great Wall, while the *tun*, which is not an administrative unit, is equivalent to the village in the latter provinces.] For instance, when people start looking for fellow members, the strong seek out the strong and elbow aside the badly-off peasants, there are squabbles over backbone activists and members which give rise to disunity, there is blind concentration of backbone activists in one place, and the rich peasants and those well-to-do peasants with fairly strong tendencies towards capitalism seize the opportunity to rig up mutual-aid teams of poor quality or rich peasants' co-operatives of their own. All this clearly demonstrates that, with the immense growth of agricultural co-operation, it is not enough to think only in terms of setting up new co-operatives when carrying out the Party's policy and guiding the movement. It is necessary to think in terms of the entire *tsun* [*i.e.*, the entire township] and of promoting the agricultural co-operative movement as a whole and

to give consideration both to enlarging the old co-operatives and to setting up new ones, both to developing the co-operatives and to bringing the mutual-aid teams to a higher stage, both to what is being done this year and to what is to be done next year, and even the year after. This is the only way to carry out the Party's policy to the full and to ensure the healthy growth of the agricultural co-operative movement.

Is it only in Heilungkiang Province that "some of the leading comrades in certain counties and districts have not kept abreast of this new feature and have not given more effective leadership in good time"? Is it only in certain counties and districts? I think it very likely that there are people in many leading organizations all over the country who typify this serious state of affairs in which the leadership lags behind the movement.

The report of the Heilungkiang Provincial Party Committee went on to say:

Hsichin Township, Shuangcheng County, has worked out a comprehensive plan for the whole township on the basis of leadership by the Party combined with the voluntary participation of the masses. This is an innovation in the method of leading the large-scale expansion of co-operation. Its importance lies first and foremost in the fact that through this kind of planning the Party's class line in the countryside has been fully translated into life, so that the unity between the poor and the middle peasants has been strengthened and a vigorous struggle has been waged against the rich peasant tendency. Backbone activists have been properly allocated to serve the general advance of the agricultural co-operative movement. Relations between the various co-operatives and between the co-operatives and the mutual-aid teams have been readjusted and strengthened, and the agricultural co-operative movement has consequently advanced along the whole front according to plan. Secondly, through this kind of planning the work of expanding agricultural co-operation on a large scale has been specifically assigned right down to the leading bodies at the basic level and to the masses, so that the township Party branch knows how to lead, the old co-operatives how to go forward, the new co-operatives how to establish themselves and the mutual-aid teams how to find their particular path towards further advance. In this way, the initiative and enthusiasm of the township Party branch

and of the masses have been brought into full play, and the correct principle of relying on the Party branch and on the experience and wisdom of the masses has been thoroughly applied. Finally, it is precisely through this kind of planning that we have been better able to ascertain the true situation in the township and to carry out the Party's policy concretely and fully. Therefore, it has been possible to avoid impetuosity and rashness on the one hand and conservatism and drift on the other, and thus correctly apply the Central Committee's policy of "active leadership and steady advance".

How were the "certain unhealthy phenomena" mentioned in the report of the Heilungkiang Provincial Party Committee actually dealt with? The report itself did not give a direct answer to this question. But the report of the Shuangcheng County Party Committee, appended to the Provincial Party Committee's report, did. It said:

As a result of comprehensive planning based on combining leadership by the Party branch and voluntary participation by the masses, the deviation of barring badly-off peasant households from the co-operatives has been corrected, the practice of concentrating too many backbone activists in one place has been stopped, the squabbles over cadres and members have disappeared, the links between the co-operatives and the mutual-aid teams have grown closer, the attempts of the rich peasants and the well-to-do middle peasants to rig up rich peasants' co-operatives or mutual-aid teams of poor quality have failed, and the plan of the Party branch has in the main been put into effect. The membership of the two older co-operatives has gone up 40 per cent, skeleton organizations for six new co-operatives have been set up, and two mutual-aid teams have been organized. If things go well, we estimate that next year [*i.e.*, in 1955] the whole township will go co-operative. At present, it is working energetically to fulfil this year's plan for expanding agricultural co-operation, increase production and ensure a good harvest. The general opinion among the township cadres is: "It is fortunate that we did all this, or things would have been in a mess. Not only would there have been trouble this year but next year as well."

Let us work the way they do.

Comprehensive planning and more effective leadership — that is our policy.

NOTES

¹ During the co-operative transformation of agriculture those who were formerly poor peasants but rose to middle peasant status after the agrarian reform were called new middle peasants. Those who were formerly middle peasants and whose economic status remained unchanged were called old middle peasants.

² At that time agricultural producers' co-operatives which were well run, middling and poorly run were usually called Class I, Class II and Class III co-operatives respectively.

³ The three poor peasant households here referred to were those of Wang Yu-kun, Wang Hsiao-chi and Wang Hsiao-pang in Nanwangchuang Village, Anping County, Hopei Province. The agricultural producers' co-operative they set up was the predecessor of the present Nanwangchuang Brigade of the people's commune of the same name.

RELY ON PARTY AND LEAGUE MEMBERS AND POOR AND LOWER-MIDDLE PEASANTS IN THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE

September 7, 1955

At present, the slogan “Rely on the poor peasants (including all the new middle peasants who were formerly poor peasants) and firmly unite with the middle peasants” remains basically correct. However, (1) well-to-do middle peasants (that is, upper-middle peasants) have emerged from among the new middle peasants, and, except for some with a higher political consciousness, they are unwilling to join the co-operatives for the time being; (2) the lower-middle peasants among the old middle peasants are generally interested in joining the co-operatives, because in economic status they are more or less similar to the lower-middle peasants among the new middle peasants, as they were not well off to start with and the interests of some were improperly encroached upon at the time of the agrarian reform. For these two reasons, in all places where co-operation has not yet reached high tide and the well-to-do middle peasants are lacking in political consciousness, it is proper first to draw into the co-operatives the following three sections of people (in batches according to the level of their political consciousness, beginning with those with a higher consciousness): (1) the poor peasants; (2) the lower-middle peasants among the new middle peasants (In the revised version of Comrade Mao Tsetung’s report the middle peasants are divided into two sections only, the upper- and the lower-middle peasants, and no mention is made of the intermediate-middle peasants so as to avoid a classification too fine for drawing distinctions. The lower-middle peasants

Inner-Party directive drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

as now defined actually cover the originally defined lower- and intermediate-middle peasants among the new middle peasants.); and (3) the lower-middle peasants among the old middle peasants. All those well-to-do middle peasants, that is, the upper-middle peasants among both the new and old middle peasants, who are as yet unwilling to join the co-operatives, should not be dragged in against their will. At present, in many places there are cases of forcing the well-to-do middle peasants into the co-operatives with an eye to obtaining their draught animals and farm implements (at too low a price and with payments over too long a period). This is actually an encroachment on their interests and a violation of the principle of "firmly uniting with the middle peasants". And we must never go against this Marxist principle. At present, in all places where co-operatives have just been set up or are not yet in a dominant position, it would be most disadvantageous if those well-to-do middle peasants with deep-seated bourgeois ideas are dragged in, or if, by their own efforts, they worm their way in to seize the leadership (rather than join out of genuine political consciousness) or form such co-operatives of poor quality as those found in Shuangcheng County, Heilungkiang Province. This would be most disadvantageous to the establishment of the leadership of the poor and lower-middle peasants, whereas it is imperative to establish this leadership in all co-operatives. (Of course exceptions should be made of a few well-to-do middle peasants who are fair-minded and competent and have a higher political consciousness.) Some say that the slogan "Rely on the poor peasants and firmly unite with the middle peasants" seems to have been discarded in our present formulation; this is not true. We have not discarded the slogan but rather made it more specific in the light of the new conditions, that is, we count the lower-middle peasants among the old middle peasants as a section of the people on whom to rely, but not those new middle peasants who have risen to become well-to-do middle peasants. This distinction is made according to their economic status and to whether they take an active attitude towards the co-operative movement. In other words, we take the poor peasants and the two sections of lower-middle peasants, who correspond to the old poor peasants, as people to rely on, and the two sections of upper-middle peasants who correspond to the old middle peasants as people firmly to unite with, and at present one way of uniting with them is to refrain from forcing them to join the co-operatives and encroaching on their interests.

Some additional points must be made clear with regard to the question of whom to rely on in the rural areas. First of all, we should rely on Party and League members. It is wrong for our Party committees from the district level up or for cadres sent to direct work in the rural areas not to rely primarily on the Party and League members there but to lump them together with the non-Party and non-League people. Second, we should rely on the more active elements among the non-Party people, who should account for some 5 per cent of the rural population (for example, there should be some 125 such activists in a township of about 2,500 people). We should do our best to cultivate a group of such activists, and we should not lump them together with the masses either. Third, we should then rely on the masses, on the poor peasants and the two sections of lower-middle peasants. Failure to be clear about whom to rely on and how to rely on them will lead to mistakes in the co-operative movement.

THE DEBATE ON THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE AND THE CURRENT CLASS STRUGGLE

October 11, 1955

Our present session has been a great debate. This debate concerns the question of whether our Party's general line for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is entirely correct or not. This all-Party debate was triggered by the question of our policy on the co-operative transformation of agriculture, on which your discussion has also centred. However, the debate covers a wide range of subjects, bearing on the work of the departments of agriculture, industry, communications, transport, finance, monetary affairs, trade, culture, education, science, public health, etc., on the transformation of handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce, the suppression of counter-revolutionaries, the armed forces and foreign affairs; in short, it touches on the whole range of our work, the work of the Party, the government, the armed forces and the people's organizations. There should be a great debate of this kind. For nothing like it has been conducted in our Party since the promulgation of the general line. We must unfold the debate in the countryside and in the cities as well so that our work in every sphere and its tempo and quality will fit the tasks set by the general line and be covered by a comprehensive plan.

Now I shall speak on a number of questions.

Concluding speech at the Enlarged Sixth Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

I. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATION AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF CAPITALIST INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

The relationship between agricultural co-operation and the transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, which is the relationship between the two tasks of basically and simultaneously accomplishing the socialist transformation of agriculture and of capitalist industry and commerce in a period of about three five-year plans, is in fact the relationship between agricultural co-operation and the bourgeoisie.

We believe that only when the alliance of the working class and the peasantry is gradually consolidated on a new basis, that of socialism, in the course of the thoroughgoing socialist transformation of agriculture, will it be possible to sever all the ties between the urban bourgeoisie and the peasantry, completely isolate the bourgeoisie and facilitate the thoroughgoing transformation of capitalist industry and commerce. The purpose of our socialist transformation of agriculture is to cut off the source of capitalism in the vast countryside.

We have not yet accomplished agricultural co-operation, the working class has not yet consolidated its alliance with the peasantry on a new basis, and the alliance remains unstable. The peasants are no longer satisfied with the alliance we formed with them in the past on the basis of the agrarian revolution. They are beginning to forget about the benefits they reaped from that alliance. They should now be given new benefits, which means socialism. The peasants have not yet attained collective prosperity, and grain and industrial raw materials are far from sufficient. In these circumstances it is likely that the bourgeoisie will find fault with us and attack us on this score. But in a few years we shall witness an entirely new situation, namely, an alliance between the working class and the peasantry on a new basis, an alliance more consolidated than ever.

The old alliance to oppose the landlords, overthrow the local despots and distribute land was a temporary one; it has become unstable after a period of stability. Since the agrarian reform polarization has taken place among the peasants. If we have nothing new to offer them and cannot help them raise their productivity, increase their income and attain collective prosperity, the poor ones will no longer trust us and will feel that there is no point in following the Communist Party. Since they remain poor after land has been dis-

tributed to them, why do they still have to follow you? As for the well-to-do ones, namely, those who have become rich peasants or grown quite well off, they won't trust us either and will invariably find the policies of the Communist Party not to their taste. As a result, neither the one nor the other, neither the poor nor the rich, will trust us, and the worker-peasant alliance will become quite shaky. To consolidate this alliance, we have to lead the peasants onto the road of socialism, enabling them to attain collective prosperity; not only the poor peasants but all of them must prosper and, what is more, they must become far better off than the present-day well-to-do peasants. Once the countryside goes co-operative, the life of the entire rural population will get better and better as the years go by and there will be more commodity grain and more industrial raw materials. By then the bourgeoisie will be silenced and find themselves completely isolated.

We now have two alliances, one with the peasants and the other with the national bourgeoisie. Both are indispensable to us, and Comrade Chou En-lai has also spoken of this. What advantage is there in our alliance with the bourgeoisie? It enables us to obtain more manufactured goods to exchange for farm produce. This was precisely what Lenin had in mind at one phase after the October Revolution. Since the state had no manufactured goods to exchange, the peasants refused to sell their grain and wouldn't take mere paper money for it. So Lenin intended to have the proletarian state power form an alliance with state capitalism in order to secure more manufactured goods to cope with the spontaneous capitalist forces in the countryside.¹ It is precisely for the purpose of securing more manufactured goods to meet the needs of the peasants and overcome their reluctance to sell their grain and even some of their industrial raw materials that we have entered into an alliance with the bourgeoisie and refrained from confiscating capitalist enterprises for the time being, and have instead adopted a policy of utilizing, restricting and transforming them. This means using our alliance with the bourgeoisie to overcome the peasants' reluctance to sell their produce. On the other hand, we rely on our alliance with the peasants to secure grain and industrial raw materials with which to bring the bourgeoisie under control. The capitalists have no raw materials, whereas the state has. If they want raw materials, they will have to sell manufactured goods to the state and go in for state capitalism. If they refuse to do so, we will deny them raw materials. In either case, they will be held in check. This will block the capitalist road the bourgeoisie wants to follow, namely,

the opening of free markets, the free acquisition of raw materials and the free sale of manufactured goods, and will in addition isolate the bourgeoisie politically. Such is the interaction between these two alliances. Of the two, our alliance with the peasants is principal, basic and primary, while our alliance with the bourgeoisie is temporary and secondary. To an economically backward country like ours both alliances are indispensable at present.

The agrarian reform enabled us to form an alliance with the peasants on the basis of democracy and enabled them to obtain land. The procuring of land by the peasants was a bourgeois-democratic revolution in nature, for it destroyed feudal ownership only, not capitalist ownership or individual ownership. That alliance made the bourgeoisie feel isolated for the first time. At the Third Plenary Session in 1950, I spoke against hitting out in all directions. The agrarian reform had not yet been carried out in vast areas of the country, nor had peasants come over entirely to our side. If we had opened fire on the bourgeoisie then, it would have been out of order. After the agrarian reform, when the peasants had entirely come over to our side, it was possible and necessary for us to start the movements against the "three evils" and the "five evils". Agricultural co-operation will enable us to consolidate our alliance with the peasants on the basis of proletarian socialism and not of bourgeois democracy. That will isolate the bourgeoisie once and for all and facilitate the final elimination of capitalism. On this matter we are quite heartless! On this matter Marxism is indeed cruel and has little mercy, for it is determined to exterminate imperialism, feudalism, capitalism, and small production to boot. In this respect, it is better not to have much mercy. Some of our comrades are too kind, they are not tough enough, in other words, they are not so Marxist. It is a very good thing, and a significant one too, to exterminate the bourgeoisie and capitalism in China, a country with a population of 600 million. Our aim is to exterminate capitalism, obliterate it from the face of the earth and make it a thing of the past. What emerges in history is bound to die out. Everything in the world is a historical phenomenon; as there is life, so there must be death. As a historical phenomenon, capitalism must also die out, and it has a very nice place to go to, that is, underground, there to "sleep".

The present international situation is favourable to our fulfilment of the general task for the transition period. We need three five-year plans basically to accomplish socialist industrialization and socialist transformation. We must strive to secure this length of time for peace-

ful construction. Three of the fifteen years have already elapsed, and twelve more will do the job. It seems likely that we will gain this time, and we must strive hard for it. We should redouble our efforts in foreign affairs and in building up national defence.

During this fifteen-year period, the class struggle at home and abroad will be very tense. We have already seen this to be the case. We have won many victories in this struggle and will continue to do so. In the internal class struggle, we have done four main things in the last twelve months: one, we have fought idealism, two, we have suppressed counter-revolutionaries, three, we have settled the question about grain, and four, we have tackled the question of agricultural co-operation. The struggles waged on these four issues were all in the nature of a struggle against the bourgeoisie; we have dealt them severe blows and are continuing to deal them crushing ones.

The struggle against idealism has been going on for a year, beginning with the question of *The Dream of the Red Chamber* and including the criticism of the *Literary Gazette* and the subsequent criticism of Hu Shih and Liang Shu-ming. We must carry out an effective campaign against idealism and we intend to devote a period of three five-year plans to the struggle. In the course of this struggle it is necessary to build up contingents of cadres well versed in Marxism and dialectical materialism, so that large numbers of our cadres and people can be armed with the fundamental theories of Marxism. With regard to the suppression of counter-revolutionaries, we plan to spend the rest of this year and the whole of next on the work of eliminating them from state factories, state commercial enterprises, co-operatives and various organizations at the county, district and township levels as well as from among army cadres and factory workers — that is from among the ranks of roughly twelve million people. Talking about counter-revolutionaries, it may seem that there aren't many left and that there are hardly any to be seen. Yet when we dig into the matter, we find that they do exist, and we have just ferreted out a batch. A big battle has also been fought on the question of grain. The bourgeoisie used the grain problem as a pretext for attacking us, a spate of rumours also emerged inside the Party, and we therefore countered by unfolding criticism. We have waged many struggles on the question of agricultural co-operation and the present session has also concentrated on it. We have launched momentous struggles on these four issues, countered the resistance and offensive of the bourgeoisie and gained the initiative.

The bourgeoisie are afraid of our struggles against them on these issues and especially of our suppression of counter-revolutionaries. We have done a good job of suppressing counter-revolutionaries. In this work we must pay attention to the criteria, if we don't, it will be very dangerous. Only those who meet the criteria are to be labelled counter-revolutionaries, that is to say, we must ferret out genuine counter-revolutionaries and not phoney ones. It is to be expected that cases of phoney counter-revolutionaries will occur. It is very difficult to exclude this possibility. But we demand that there should be fewer such cases and preferably none at all. The counter-revolutionaries must be out-and-out and unmistakable ones who completely meet the criteria; we mustn't wrong innocent people. On the other hand, some genuine counter-revolutionaries may slip through our net. You say you will make a clean sweep of them this time. Not very likely. Such cases of wriggling through are hard to avoid, but we should do our best to keep the number to a minimum.

II. A SUMMING-UP OF THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CO-OPERATION

With regard to agricultural co-operation, the numerous innovations of the masses have shattered many illusions and erroneous views. This time the discussion has settled quite a few questions which many people did not clearly understand a few months ago.

First, there is the question of which is better, a big or a small expansion. This has been a major issue generating much controversy and now it is settled. The masses demand a big expansion, and the general task for the transition period demands that agriculture should adapt itself to industry; therefore, the view in favour of a small expansion is wrong.

Second, the question whether expansion is possible in areas which were liberated late, in mountain areas, in backward townships and in areas affected by natural disasters. Now this question is settled. It is possible in all such places.

Third, the question whether co-operatives can be set up in minority nationality areas. Now it has been proved that they can be set up wherever conditions are ripe. In some places, such as Tibet and the

Taliang and Hsiaoliang Mountains, where conditions are not yet ripe, co-operatives should not be set up.

Fourth, the question whether co-operatives can be set up without funds, carts and oxen or without the well-to-do middle peasants. Now this has been proved possible too.

Fifth, the fallacy that "it is easy to set up a co-operative but hard to consolidate it" has been exploded. Setting one up is not so easy and consolidating it is not necessarily so hard. If you insist that it is easy to set up but hard to consolidate a co-operative, you are actually speaking for setting up few or none.

Sixth, the question whether co-operatives can be set up without farm machinery. The view that there have to be machines before co-operatives can be set up is no longer popular, but it lingers on. This fallacy can also be exploded.

Seventh, the question whether poorly run co-operatives should all be dissolved. Of course a few that definitely cannot carry on may revert to mutual-aid teams, but generally the so-called poorly run co-operatives should not be dissolved, for they can take a turn for the better after a check-up.

Eighth, the statement that "if you don't get off the horse quickly, there will be the danger of breaking up the worker-peasant alliance" is probably an "argument" relayed down from the Rural Work Department of the Central Committee. This department not only manufactures rumours but also produces a lot of "arguments". I think that this statement is in the main "correct" — only a single word needs to be changed, that is, the word "off" be changed into "on". You comrades of the Rural Work Department do not have to feel discouraged, for I have accepted almost all your words and changed only one. The difference lies in a single word, our controversy is over just one word — you want to get off the horse while I want to get on. "If you don't get on the horse quickly, there will be the danger of breaking up the worker-peasant alliance", and danger there certainly will be.

Ninth, the charge that "the co-operatives are to blame for the loss of oxen" is not quite in keeping with the actual conditions. The chief cause of the loss of oxen is to be found not in the co-operatives but in floods, in the high price of ox hides and in the shortage of fodder, while some oxen are too old and have to be slaughtered.

Tenth, it is wrong to say that "the fundamental cause of the tense situation in the countryside is that too many co-operatives have been set up". The tense situation in the countryside last spring was chiefly due

to the grain problem. The so-called grain shortage was in most cases fictitious; the clamour about it was raised by landlords, rich peasants and well-to-do middle peasants. We didn't have time to conduct extensive education among the peasant masses to counter it; besides, there were shortcomings in our work regarding grain. We over-purchased 7,000 million catties last year, not knowing at the time the proper amount of grain we should purchase. Now we are making an adjustment and plan to purchase 7,000 million catties less. Coupled with this year's good harvest, this will ease the tense situation in the countryside.

Eleventh, there is still another remark in circulation, "The superiority of the co-operatives can last only three years"; this is pessimistic. In my view, their superiority will certainly not be limited to three years, for socialism will last a very long time. In the future, when socialism is no longer the embodiment of superiority, communism with its superiority will take its place.

Twelfth, should we set up a number of co-operatives of the advanced type in the near future? In the past people were not clear about this question, and it has been raised at the present session. A batch of such co-operatives should be set up. As for the number, that's for you to consider.

Thirteenth, it is also wrong to say that "no co-operatives can be set up with junks and animal-drawn carts". As we see it now, the millions of working people engaged in junk or animal-drawn cart transport should also be organized into co-operatives.

We have settled all these questions in the light of your discussions. This is a tremendous achievement on the part of the present plenary session of the Central Committee.

III. ON THE QUESTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND MORE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Comprehensive planning should include, first, a plan for co-operatives, second, a plan for agricultural production and, third, an over-all economic plan. An over-all economic plan for the countryside embraces side-line production, handicrafts, diversified economic undertakings, multi-purpose undertakings, nearby land reclamation and population shifts, supply and marketing co-operatives, credit co-

operatives, banks and technique popularization stations, etc., as well as afforestation of barren mountains and villages. I think the barren mountains in the north in particular should be afforested, and they undoubtedly can be. Do you comrades from the north have courage enough for this? Many places in the south need afforestation too. It will be fine if in a number of years we can see various places in the south and north clothed with greenery. This will benefit agriculture, industry and all other spheres.

What other plans should be made? A plan for culture and education. It should embrace eliminating illiteracy, opening primary schools, setting up middle schools geared to the needs of the rural areas, adding a few courses in agriculture to the middle school curriculum, publishing popular pamphlets and books suited to the needs of the peasants, establishing rural broadcasting networks and film projection teams, arranging cultural and recreational activities, and so on. There should also be plans for the consolidation and building of the Party and Youth League organizations, for women's work and for the suppression of counter-revolutionaries. All these should be included in a comprehensive plan.

Plans should be of the following kinds: (1) A plan for a village co-operative. Every co-operative, however small, should make a plan and learn how to do so. (2) A plan for an entire township. Our country has over 220,000 townships, each of which should have a plan. (3) A plan for an entire county. We hope every county will make one. Some counties have already made good plans that are interesting to read. The minds of the comrades there are emancipated, they defy heaven and earth and are not fettered by shackles and manacles, and their plans are dynamic. (4) A plan for an entire province (or an autonomous region, or the suburban areas of a municipality). Here the stress should be put on plans for entire townships and for entire counties. These two links should be grasped, and a number of such plans should be drawn up promptly. For instance, in each province plans for three or four counties should be made and distributed as examples.

Plans for co-operative transformation should specify different rates of development for different areas. There are three kinds of areas. The first comprises the greater part of our rural areas, the second a section of the smaller part of our rural areas and the third the remainder. For the greater part of our rural areas the development should be in three waves, that is, three winters and springs. The three waves

consist of this winter and next spring, next winter and the following spring, and another winter and spring. Three winters and springs make three waves, one wave surging after another, and in between there should be an interval. There is a valley between two mountains and there is a trough between two waves. The first kind of area will have basically completed semi-socialist co-operative transformation by the spring of 1958. For the second kind of area, such as areas in North China and the Northeast and also some suburban areas, two winters and springs, or two waves, will suffice. Among them a few will have basically gone co-operative by next spring, and thus they will reach the goal in only one wave. The third kind of area, that is, the remainder of the smaller part of our rural areas, will need four, five or even six winters and springs. This does not include some of the minority nationality areas, namely, the Taliang and Hsiaoliang Mountains, Tibet and other minority nationality areas where conditions are not yet ripe, and no co-operative should be set up under such circumstances. What is meant by the basic completion of semi-socialist co-operation? That 70 to 80 per cent of the rural population have joined semi-socialist co-operatives. Here a margin is allowed, 70 per cent will be all right, and so will 75 or 80 per cent or slightly over 80 per cent — this is what we call the basic completion of semi-socialist co-operation. For the rest of the rural population, co-operation will come about later. Being too slow is not good, nor is being overhasty, both are opportunistic. There are two kinds of opportunism, being slow and being hasty. Putting it in this way will make it easier for ordinary people to understand.

Province (municipality or autonomous region), prefecture and county — all three levels must constantly acquaint themselves with the development of the movement and tackle any problem as it arises. Make sure that you don't wait until problems pile up before making a reckoning, that would be firing belated shots. In the past, much of our work was done in this way, problems were left to pile up instead of being solved as they arose, and a reckoning or criticism was made only at the very end. Some comrades made this mistake during the movements against the "three evils" and the "five evils". Don't go in for criticism after the event. Of course, criticisms have to be made after the event, but it will be best to make them the moment a mistake begins to show itself. It is not good to go in for criticism after the event and fail to give guidance according to the changing circumstances.

What is to be done when things turn out unfavourably? When this happens, put on the brakes at once, or in other words, make a halt. It is like driving a car, we put on the brakes at once when we meet with danger in going down a steep slope. The provincial, prefectural and county authorities all have the power to put on the brakes. Attention must be paid to guarding against the "Left" deviation. To guard against the "Left" deviation is Marxism, not opportunism. Marxism does not call for "Left" deviations, and "Left" opportunism is not Marxism.

In setting up co-operatives what should we compete in from now on? In quality, in measuring up to norms. As for quantity or speed, what we specified earlier will do, and the emphasis now is on competition in quality. And what are the criteria for quality? They are increased production and no loss of livestock. How can production be increased and loss of livestock be avoided? To this end, it is necessary to observe the principles of voluntary participation and mutual benefit, make comprehensive plans and give flexible guidance. Given these conditions, the co-operatives, I think, will be able to achieve better quality, increase production and prevent the loss of livestock. We must by all means avoid the mistake once made in the Soviet Union which led to the slaughtering of livestock in large numbers. The next two years are crucial, and chiefly the next five months, namely, this winter and next spring. I would ask the comrades here to see to it that, starting from November this year and up to March next year, no serious trouble nor any loss of oxen in large numbers occurs. Since we have only a few tractors, oxen are a treasure, they are the chief implement in agricultural production.

In the next five months, the leading cadres at the provincial, prefectural, county, district and township levels, and first of all the Party secretaries and deputy secretaries, must immerse themselves in the question of co-operatives and familiarize themselves with the various problems connected with them. Is the time too short? I think five months will do, if you make a serious effort. Of course it is very important for comrades at the provincial level to do so, but it will be very dangerous if comrades at the county, district and township levels in particular do not go into this question and know practically nothing about co-operatives when many are being set up. What if a comrade simply can't dig in? He should be given a different job. The Central Committee will probably call a similar conference five months hence,

that is, after next March. We shall then have a competition in quality, and speakers at the conference will not be expected to repeat their present speeches, for there must be something new, that is, the emphasis should be on questions of comprehensive planning, management and methods of leadership. They should speak on efficient methods of setting up more and better co-operatives faster. In other words, they should deal with the question of quality.

Methods of leadership are very important. To avoid mistakes, one must pay attention to these methods and strengthen leadership. Here are some suggestions about methods of leadership, see if they are feasible. One is to hold several large or small meetings yearly to solve current problems, as we are doing now. When a problem crops up, you should be able to see what is universal in a particular case. You don't have to catch all the sparrows and dissect them before you can prove the fact that "small as it is, the sparrow has all the vital organs". No scientist has ever acted this way. Once you are clear about a few co-operatives, you will be able to draw proper conclusions. Besides the method of holding meetings, you can use the telegram and the telephone and go on inspection tours, these too are very important methods of leadership. In addition, every province should select suitable personnel to run publications well and improve them for the prompt exchange of experience. Here is another suggestion which I would like you to try out. I spent eleven days reading 120-odd reports, making corrections and writing notes to them. In this manner I have "travelled all the kingdoms" and gone farther than Confucius, "travelling" as far as Yunnan and Sinkiang.² Perhaps each province and autonomous region might compile a book every year or every six months, with one article from each county, so that the experience of all counties can be exchanged; this will facilitate the rapid spread of the co-operative movement. Still another method is to issue bulletins. The county Party committee should submit bulletins to the prefectural Party committee, the prefectural to the provincial or autonomous region Party committee, and the latter to the Central Committee, reporting on the number of co-operatives set up and on the problems that have arisen. The leadership at various levels will acquaint itself with the situation through these bulletins and be able to find solutions to problems when they arise. These are a few suggestions concerning methods of leadership for the comrades present to consider.

IV. ON IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

All past experience has demonstrated one point: ideological struggle must hit the mark. There must be confrontation of ideas, to use a current expression. As in fighting, you thrust your sword at me and I thrust mine back, and the two swords must cross — this is confrontation. Without a confrontation of ideas no clarity and thoroughness can be attained, and that's not good. At this session we have had confrontation, thus attaining clarity and thoroughness in our thinking. The first advantage of this method is that it helps most comrades to get clear on questions, and the second that it helps those comrades who have erred to correct their mistakes.

For comrades who have erred, I think there are only two requirements: one, they themselves must be willing to make revolution; two, other people must allow them to go on making revolution. There are individuals who don't want to go on making revolution themselves, for example, Chen Tu-hsiu did not want to, nor did Chang Kuo-tao, nor Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih, but such individuals are a mere handful. Most people want to go on making revolution. Then there is the other requirement: they must be allowed to make revolution. We should not act like the bogus foreign devil in *The True Story of Ah Q*, who bars Ah Q from revolution, nor should we ape Wang Lun the scholar-in-white³ in *Water Margin*, who also bars other people from revolution. Whoever bars others from revolution will find himself in a very perilous position. Wang Lun, the scholar-in-white, who bars other people from revolution, ends up losing his life. Kao Kang barred other people from revolution, and didn't he end up losing his life too?

Historical experience shows that most people who have committed errors of dogmatism or empiricism can correct them. But this calls for two pre-conditions, serious criticism on the one hand and a forbearing attitude on the other. It is not good to do without the latter, for its absence would lead to unnatural relations. Who doesn't make some mistake or other? Everyone without exception makes mistakes, only some make major mistakes and others minor ones. In any case the incorrigible are few, such as Chen Tu-hsiu, Chang Kuo-tao, Kao Kang, Jao Shu-shih and also Chen Kuang and Tai Chi-ying. Except for a few persons like them, all the others who have erred can be saved and can correct their mistakes with the help of their comrades. We should act

in this way and have confidence. On their part, people who have erred should have confidence too.

Some comrades in the Rural Work Department of the Central Committee, and principally Comrade Teng Tzu-hui, have made mistakes. The mistakes he has made this time are Right deviationist and empiricist in nature. Comrade Teng Tzu-hui has made a self-criticism. Though some comrades at group meetings felt that it was not thorough enough, we of the Political Bureau and other comrades have talked it over and found it satisfactory on the whole. For the present the understanding he has shown is good enough. It should be acknowledged that Comrade Teng Tzu-hui did a lot of work during the long revolutionary struggle and made contributions. But he should not have allowed his contributions to become a handicap. He himself has admitted this, saying that he has to some extent flaunted his seniority. One must be modest. Provided Comrade Teng Tzu-hui is modest and ready to accept the help of his comrades, we believe he will be able to correct his mistakes.

Comrade Teng Tzu-hui once advanced the kind of programmatic formulation which advocated reliance on the businessmen (that is, on the bourgeoisie) and the "four big freedoms". That formulation was wrong and was a veritable bourgeois programme in nature, a capitalist programme, not a proletarian one, and it ran counter to the decision of the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee on the restriction of the bourgeoisie. We are now following a policy of restriction towards both the urban bourgeoisie and the rural bourgeoisie (the rich peasants). Therefore, the "four big freedoms", under which no restrictions are placed on hiring labourers, trading, money-lending and renting out land, must be called in question. I would say there are "four little freedoms". Here the difference is between big and little. With restrictions, the bourgeoisie have a bit of these freedoms, just a tiny bit. We must prepare the conditions for depriving the bourgeoisie of these little freedoms, too. Towards the urban bourgeoisie we adopt a policy of utilization, restriction and transformation. We must utilize it, but at the same time we must restrict that aspect which is detrimental to the nation's economy and the people's livelihood. Such a policy is neither "Left" nor Right. No restriction at all would mean leaning too much to the Right. Extreme restriction, which bars the bourgeoisie from any undertaking whatever, would mean leaning too much to the "Left". Lenin said it would be not only foolish but suicidal for a political party to try to eradicate capitalism at one stroke

when millions upon millions of small producers still exist.⁴ But Comrade Teng Tzu-hui's formulation was incorrect because he made no mention of restriction, and it differed from that of the Central Committee and of the Second Plenary Session.

Some comrades take almost no heed of the Party's resolutions and the policies advocated by the Party over long periods, as if they had never read or heard of them — I don't know why. For instance, the mutual-aid and co-operative movement went on for many years in the central revolutionary base area, in Yen-an and in each and every base area, and yet these comrades don't seem to have seen or heard anything about it. Back in the winter of 1951, the Central Committee adopted a resolution on mutual aid and co-operation in agricultural production, which they likewise ignore. As late as 1953, they still did not talk about fundamentals but took pleasure in giving small favours. By their not talking about fundamentals we mean they never talked about socialism, and by taking pleasure in giving small favours we mean they took pleasure in giving the "four big freedoms". That is to say, some comrades take no heed at all of the Party's resolutions or of some of the policies and programmes it has long advocated; instead they go their own way. They never try to find out whether and how questions of a similar nature have been discussed before. Some historians take pains to study even oracle bones, inscriptions on bronzes and stone tablets and other relics of the ancient past which have been unearthed, whereas these comrades pay not the least heed to our recent past and don't bother to look into it. In short, they completely ignore what is going on beyond their immediate surroundings and just write and speak as they like; for instance, they have prated about the "four big freedoms", and well, they have ended up running their heads against a wall.

Some other comrades always prefer decentralism, they assert their independence and even set up independent kingdoms, finding dictatorship very much to their taste. At the outset it was in order to be comfortable that they set up kingdoms and proclaimed themselves kings. But what was the result? In the end they found themselves very uncomfortable as they came under criticism. Isn't there an opera called *Ascending the Throne*? Look what great comfort Hsueh Ping-kuei enjoyed on becoming king, for in those days there was no self-criticism. That was not good. Many people are always reluctant to consult others. Many comrades pay lip-service to collective leadership, but actually they are inordinately fond of personal dictatorship, as if they would not look like leaders unless they were dictatorial. One does not have to be

dictatorial to be a leader, don't you know that? The bourgeoisie has bourgeois democracy, it stresses class dictatorship. The proletariat and the Communist Party must likewise exercise class dictatorship, it is bad to practise personal dictatorship. When a problem comes up, it is always advisable to consult with others, have it solved by the collective and pool the wisdom of the many; that's the better way.

Still another point needs to be taken up here. Many comrades bury themselves in office work and do not study problems. Mustn't office work be attended to? Certainly it must. It won't do to neglect such work, but it would be dangerous to attend to it exclusively without studying problems. If you don't go among the cadres and the masses, or if, when among them, you are always taking them to task instead of consulting and exchanging views with them, saying "What do you think of my ideas? Please tell me your opinions", you won't be able to sense the political climate, your nose will become insensitive and you will catch cold politically. Once your nose is stopped up, you can't tell what the climate is at a given time. Today Comrade Chen Yi said that one must be able to grasp a thing when it is in the bud. A person must be most slow-witted if he fails to see what is already widespread and abundant. This situation calls for attention. It is very bad for anyone to be occupied solely with office work to the neglect of studying problems, going among the masses and cadres and consulting with them.

V. OTHER QUESTIONS

Most of the questions I am now going to discuss have been raised by the comrades here.

First, with regard to removing well-to-do middle peasants from leading positions in the co-operatives, it is necessary to pay attention to the steps to be taken and the methods to be used; do not dismiss them all at once. Although they are not fit to be leaders, they are nevertheless working people. Each case should be decided on its merits, depending on how the person acquits himself. Some well-to-do middle peasants must be removed, for it simply won't do to let them continue at their posts. But it must be made clear to the masses (for example, the members of the co-operative) as well as to the well-to-do middle peasant concerned that he is not really fit to go on serving as a leader. There

is another condition, namely, he is not to be removed until a better qualified person is ready to succeed him or has been trained to take his place. Some of the well-to-do middle peasants may continue at their posts after making a self-criticism and correcting their mistakes, others may be made deputy leaders or committee members. Of course those who have done a good job should not be removed, even though they are well-to-do middle peasants. Do not treat well-to-do middle peasants as rich peasants, they are not. Do not remove them all at once. This question must be approached with care and properly settled. The provinces and localities are expected to consider whether the various ways mentioned above are feasible.

Second, it must be made clear at the Party branches and among the masses that when we now say that the lower-middle peasants and the upper-middle peasants are two different social strata, it is not because we are redefining class status but because different social strata actually take different attitudes towards co-operative transformation, some active, some passive, and a similar difference exists among individuals within the same stratum. For instance, even among the poor peasants there are people who do not want to join the co-operatives for the time being. This fact can be used to convince the well-to-do middle peasants: "Look! Among the poor and lower-middle peasants there are also people who are rather passive. They don't want to come in, so we won't ask them to join. As you well-to-do middle peasants don't want to come in now, you may stay out too." We should first draw in those who are keen on joining, then make propaganda among a second group until they become keen enough to join, and then among a third group. This should be done by stages and in batches. In time all will join the co-operatives. So it is not a question of redefining class status.

Third, on the question of landlords and rich peasants joining the co-operatives. Perhaps we can try the following way: take the county together with the township as a unit (it is not enough to take the county alone as the unit, for a county may have basically gone co-operative while there may still be no co-operatives at all in some of its townships). When a county and township have basically gone co-operative, that is, when 70 to 80 per cent of the peasant households have joined, the consolidated co-operatives can start dealing with the landlords and rich peasants in groups and by stages according to their behaviour. Those who have a good record and are honest and law-abiding may be given co-operative membership. Others may join in collective labour in the co-operative and receive their share of remuneration but without

co-operative membership, being actually members on probation; if they do well, they too can become members, and so they will have something to look forward to. Those in a third group will not be allowed to join the co-operative for the time being, the question will be taken up later and settled on an individual basis. None of the landlords or rich peasants admitted to the co-operative are to be appointed to posts in it. As for educated young people from landlord or rich peasant families who have been through some testing, can't they be given such jobs as literacy teachers in the villages? In places where there are very few other intellectuals, there is a need to have them serve as literacy teachers under the leadership and supervision of the Party branch and the co-operative management committee. At present, there are still a fair number of such educated young people among the primary school teachers. These young people from landlord or rich peasant families are only seventeen or eighteen years old and have just finished primary or junior middle school, and I think it unnecessarily strict not to let them serve even as literacy teachers. We can enlist them in teaching the peasants to read and write, in wiping out illiteracy. Please consider whether this is feasible. However, assigning them to such work as bookkeeping would be rather risky.

Fourth, as regards the conditions for establishing co-operatives of the advanced type and how many to establish, I shan't say anything today but ask you comrades to study these conditions and then we'll discuss the matter next year. Different localities can act according to the existing conditions. In short, such co-operatives can be set up where the conditions are ripe and not otherwise, and you may start with only a few and later increase their number step by step.

Fifth, as to the time for establishing co-operatives, perhaps you can consider whether it must be concentrated in winter and spring each year and whether a number can also be set up in summer or autumn, as is actually being done in some places already. But it must be pointed out that there has to be an interval for rest and consolidation between two waves and that after a batch of co-operatives has been set up, there should be check-ups and consolidation before more are established. It is like fighting battles, there should be rest and consolidation between two battles. It is entirely wrong to do without, leave no interval and allow no breathing space. There was once the view in the army that rest and consolidation were dispensable, that a respite was unnecessary and that what was necessary was to march on and fight all the time, which, as a matter of fact, is impossible. Men must sleep.

If the meeting we are holding today should not adjourn but go on and on indefinitely, everybody would be against this, including me. Men need a long rest and consolidation every day — seven or eight, or at least five or six, hours of sleep, not counting the shorter rests during the day. To say that the establishment of co-operatives, a matter of such major importance, can dispense with rest and consolidation is most naive.

Sixth, “Run co-operatives with diligence and thrift” is a very good slogan. It has been put forward by people at the grass-roots level. It is necessary to practise strict economy and combat waste. A vigorous campaign against waste is now under way in the cities and also in the villages. We must encourage diligence and thrift in running the household, running the co-operative and building the country. Our nation must be first diligent and second thrifty; we must not be lazy and extravagant. Laziness leads to decay, that is not good. To run co-operatives with diligence and thrift it is necessary to raise labour productivity, practise strict economy, reduce costs of production, institute economic accounting and combat extravagance and waste. All co-operatives must raise labour productivity and reduce costs of production. As for economic accounting, it is to be taken up gradually. As the co-operatives grow in size, they cannot manage without economic accounting; they must learn to do it step by step.

Seventh, it is a shortcoming of this session that no one has spoken on the subject of state farms. I hope the Rural Work Department of the Central Committee as well as the Ministry of Agriculture will study this question. In future the proportion of state farms will grow year by year.

Eighth, we must go on opposing Han chauvinism. It is one kind of bourgeois ideology. The Han people are so numerous, they are liable to look down on the minority nationalities and not to help them wholeheartedly, so we must relentlessly fight Han chauvinism. Naturally, narrow nationalism may arise among the minority nationalities, that also is to be opposed. But of the two the chief one, the one to be opposed first, is Han chauvinism. So long as the comrades of Han nationality take the correct attitude and treat the minority nationalities with real fairness, so long as the nationality policy they follow and the stand they take on the question of nationality relations are entirely Marxist and do not reflect bourgeois viewpoints, that is to say, so long as they are free from Han chauvinism, it is comparatively easy to overcome narrow nationalist views among the minority nationalities. At present, there is still a good deal of Han chauvinism, for example, monopolizing the affairs of the minority nationalities, showing no respect for their

customs and folk-ways, being self-righteous, looking down on them and saying how backward they are. At the National Conference of our Party last March, I said that China could not do without its minority nationalities. There are scores of nationalities in China. The regions inhabited by the minority nationalities are more extensive in area than those inhabited by the Han nationality and abound in material wealth of all kinds. Our national economy cannot do without the economy of the minority nationalities.

Ninth, as for the campaign to wipe out illiteracy, I think we had better get it going. In some places, this campaign has itself been wiped out. This is not good. It is illiteracy and not the campaign that should be wiped out in the course of co-operative transformation, that is, we should wipe out illiteracy and not the campaign to wipe it out.

Tenth, some people ask, what is meant by "Left" and Right deviations? As we have said on previous occasions, everything moves in space and time. Here I'll chiefly deal with the question of time. If the observation you make of the movement of things does not agree with reality, it is a "Left" deviation if your judgment is premature, and it is a Right deviation if your judgment lags behind. Take the co-operative movement for example. Although the conditions are already ripe, such as the masses' enthusiasm, the widespread presence of mutual-aid teams and the leadership of the Party, some comrades still deny this. When it is already possible (not several years ago, but right now) for the co-operative movement to develop in a big way, they still say it is impossible. All this is a Right deviation. On the other hand, it is a "Left" deviation if it is demanded that 80 per cent of the whole nation should go co-operative in a very short time, when such conditions as the level of political consciousness of the peasants and the leadership of the Party are not yet ripe. As the old Chinese sayings go, "When a melon is ripe, it falls off its stem," and "When water flows, a channel is formed." We should act in accordance with specific conditions and achieve our aims naturally instead of forcing their attainment. Take childbirth for instance. It requires nine months. If, in the seventh month, the doctor should exert pressure and force the child out, that would not be good, that would be a "Left" deviation. If, on the other hand, the unborn child is already nine months old and very much wants to come out and yet you don't allow it, that would be a Right deviation. In short, everything moves in time. When the right time comes for something to be done, it has to be done. If you don't

allow it, that is a Right deviation. If the right time has not come for something and yet you try to force it through, that is a “Left” deviation.

Eleventh, some people ask, isn’t it possible that “Left” deviationist mistakes will occur? Our reply is that it is entirely possible. If the leadership in a given locality, whether a township Party branch or a district, county, prefectural or provincial Party committee, does not take note of the level of political consciousness of the masses and the development of the mutual-aid teams, and if instead of drawing up plans, exercising control and establishing co-operatives by stages and in batches, it only seeks quantity and does not care for quality, serious “Left” deviationist mistakes are bound to appear. When there is an upsurge of enthusiasm among the masses, when everyone asks to join the co-operative, it is imperative to envisage all kinds of difficulties and every unfavourable condition conceivable, openly make them known to the masses and let the masses consider the matter fully. If they are not afraid, they can join up; if they are afraid, they don’t have to. Of course, we must not frighten people away. I suppose I won’t scare you away today, for we have been in session for so many days. It is necessary to cool people’s heads at the right moment so that they won’t become hot-headed.

We are opposed to boundless anxiety and countless taboos and regulations. Does this mean that we should have no anxiety at all? Not a single taboo? Not a single regulation? Of course that is not the case. Who is there who does not have anxiety, the necessary anxiety, the warranted anxiety? And we should have the necessary taboos and regulations too. Without a few taboos, without a few regulations, how can we carry on? It is absolutely right to have the necessary anxiety, taboos and regulations, and the necessary pauses, intermissions, putting on of brakes and cut-offs.

Here is one method: when people are on the point of becoming conceited, when they are about to get cocky, they should be assigned a new task (for instance, we have now proposed a competition in quality and next year when you come here, the results will be compared; by then the question of quantity will have become secondary) so that they won’t have a chance to become conceited, as they won’t have the time. We have tried this method before. When an army unit won a battle and some comrades started talking about it with gusto to people around them and got too cocky, you set them a new task — to fight another battle. No sooner was a new task set than they had to start considering

the problems it entailed and make preparations, so that they stopped being cocky and had no time for conceit.

Twelfth, some comrades have suggested that the county level might perhaps be given the right to a margin of manoeuvre of 10 per cent. Take the establishment of co-operatives, their number might be either 10 per cent less or 10 per cent more. I think this suggestion can be adopted, it is a good one, so don't make things too rigid. Please give the matter further thought.

Thirteenth, aren't there people who want to reverse our decision? There are quite a number. They think the co-operatives will come to nothing and what we are doing will be entirely reversed, and they say we are not Marxists, but opportunists. But, in my view, as the general trend indicates, this decision is irreversible.

Fourteenth, some people ask, what will be the trend in the future? It will be the basic accomplishment of socialist industrialization as well as of the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce within a period of about three five-year plans. So far as I can see, that will be the trend. Besides, it may be added, as I indicated at the last National Conference of our Party, that in about fifty to seventy-five years, that is, within a period of ten to fifteen five-year plans, we shall be able to make China a powerful socialist country.

During this period of fifty to seventy-five years, many serious and complicated conflicts and struggles will certainly take place abroad, at home and inside the Party, and we are bound to meet with a lot of difficulties. In our own experience, we have lived through I don't know how many conflicts, armed and peaceful, with bloodshed and without, so how can you guarantee that there will be none in future? There will certainly be conflicts, and not a few, but a lot. Among them there will be the outbreak of a world war, the dropping of atom bombs on our heads, and the appearance of Berias, Kao Kangs, Chang Kuo-taos and Chen Tu-hsius. Many things cannot be foreseen now. But, as we Marxists see it, it is definite that all difficulties can be overcome and that a powerful socialist China will emerge. Is that certain? I think it is. According to Marxism it is. The bourgeoisie has prepared a grave-digger for itself. Its grave is ready. How can it not die? Speaking of trends, this is roughly the trend.

Fifteenth, you have made many suggestions for the revision of the two documents — the resolution and the regulations. That is very good.

We'll have your suggestions collected for consideration. After its adoption today, the resolution will be revised and published in a few days by the Political Bureau. The regulations will take a longer time. The democratic personages will have to be consulted and the legislative procedure will have to be followed. Or, like the Draft Bill, the regulations may first be submitted to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress for discussion and then sent to the State Council for publication in order to get opinions. Tentatively and for a period of time, localities may act in accordance with the regulations until they are submitted to the National People's Congress for adoption next year.

Finally, in passing I would ask you to pay attention to writing. I hope all present will become "teachers of composition". Your articles are well written, except, perhaps, for a few shortcomings. You should take care to help other people improve their style of writing. Now, of the articles written by many comrades, some are long-winded and devoid of substance, but these are relatively few; the chief defects are an overuse of classical Chinese and too strong a flavour of the semi-literary, semi-vernacular style. In writing articles one must pay attention to logic. That is to say, one must pay attention to the structure of an article or speech as a whole, and there must be some sort of relation between the beginning, the middle and the end, a sort of inner relationship, and the three must not be at variance with one another. One must also observe the rules of grammar. Many comrades tend to omit the subject or the object of a sentence when it should not be omitted, or use adverbs as verbs or even leave out verbs. All this is ungrammatical. Attention must also be paid to rhetoric, to how to write more vividly. In short, to be logical, to be grammatical and to have a better command of rhetoric — these are the three points I would like you to bear in mind when you write.

NOTES

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tax in Kind".

² This refers to the compilation of *How to Run Agricultural Producers' Cooperatives* by Comrade Mao Tsetung, who undertook it after reading the reports on agricultural co-operation sent in by various localities. See "Prefaces to *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*" below.

³In the classical Chinese novel *Water Margin*, Wang Lun (nicknamed “the scholar-in-white”) becomes head of the peasant rebels when they seize Liangshan Mountain, and he wants to remain head. When Lin Chung, chief instructor to the capital garrison, is forced to rebel against the authorities and seeks shelter on Liangshan Mountain, Wang Lun first tries to turn him away and then makes things hard for him. Later, he refuses to allow Chao Kai, a rebel peasant leader, and his followers to join forces with the Liangshan Mountain rebels. In the end Wang Lun is killed by Lin Chung.

⁴V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*

PREFACE TO *SOCIALIST UPSURGE* *IN CHINA'S COUNTRYSIDE*

September and December 1955

PREFACE I

September 25, 1941

The general line of the Chinese Communist Party for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is basically to accomplish the industrialization of China together with the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. This transition period will cover roughly eighteen years, that is, the three years of rehabilitation plus the span of three five-year plans. On the surface there has been a consensus in our Party on this formulation of the general line and the specification of the time-limit, but in reality there have been differences of opinion. At present, these differences manifest themselves chiefly on the question of the socialist transformation of agriculture, or agricultural co-operation.

Some people say that in the last few years there seems to have been a certain rule operating in agricultural co-operation, namely, expansion is encouraged in winter but is bound to be opposed in the spring by certain persons as rash advance. There are reasons for that remark, for they have seen opposition to the alleged rash advance on several occasions. For example, there was an expansion in the winter of 1952, only to be opposed as a rash advance in the spring of 1953; again there was an expansion in the winter of 1954, only to be opposed once more as a rash advance in the following spring. Opposition to the alleged rash advancement not only halting the expansion but compulsorily dissolving (or "axing") large numbers of co-operatives already set up, thus rousing dissatisfaction among the cadres and peasant masses. Some peasants were so disgusted that they refused to eat, or kept to their beds,

or skipped work a dozen days in a row. They said, "You were the ones who told us to set up the co-operatives, and now you are the ones who tell us to disband them." Dissolution gladdened the well-to-do middle peasants but saddened the poor peasants. When the news about the halting of expansion or the dissolution reached the poor peasants in Hupeh Province, they were "chilled to the bone", but some middle peasants said, "This is as good as a pilgrimage to Mulan Hill." (On Mulan Hill in Huangpi County, Hupeh Province, there stands the Mulan Temple, a place peasants like to visit on pilgrimage.)

Why this wavering on the part of some comrades which most people find absolutely uncalled for? Because they have fallen under the influence of some of the middle peasants. At the initial stage of the co-operative movement some of the middle peasants, especially the well-to-do middle peasants who had strong leanings towards capitalism, were averse to socialist transformation. Here what makes the difference is the Party's policy and method of work with respect to the middle peasants in the co-operative movement. Many middle peasants, mainly the new and old lower-middle peasants, who are not so well off and have a higher level of political consciousness, are willing to join the co-operatives, provided we pursue a policy which benefits both strata, that is, the poor and also the middle peasants, and not a policy exclusively beneficial to the former, and provided our method of work is good. However, even if we follow this policy, some middle peasants will still prefer to stay outside the co-operatives for the time being and "to remain free if only for a year or two". This is perfectly understandable, for co-operation means a change in the peasants' private ownership of the means of production and the entire mode of management; for them this is a fundamental change, so naturally they want to give the matter careful consideration and for some time may find it difficult to make a decision. Some of our comrades failed to tackle problems in accordance with the Party's policy and method of work and, when faced with complaints from the well-to-do middle peasants and certain flaws in our work, they panicked, raised a hue and cry against "rash advance", and "axed" co-operatives at will as if they were malignant tumours which would be fatal unless removed at once. But this is not at all how things stand. Shortcomings there are in our work, but on the whole the movement is healthy. The masses of the poor and lower-middle peasants welcome the co-operatives. If some of the middle peasants want to wait and see, we should let them. As for the well-to-do middle peasants, we should give them even

more time to wait and see, except for those willing to join. At present, the main defect in the movement is that in many places the Party leadership has failed to keep pace; the comrades in charge have not taken the leadership of the whole movement into their hands, they have no over-all plan for the province, county, district or township, but adopt a piecemeal approach, and they lack initiative, enthusiasm, warm responsiveness and drive. Thus a big problem has arisen. With the movement spreading widely at the grass roots but receiving insufficient attention from above, some troubles naturally occur. In the face of such troubles, instead of providing stronger leadership and better planning, our comrades take a negative attitude and try to check the progress of the movement or rush to "axe" a number of co-operatives. Of course this is wrong and is sure to give rise to more troubles.

We have just compiled a book, *How to Run Agricultural Producers' Co-operatives*.¹ It includes factual examples from various provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions, a total of more than 120 articles. The bulk of the material covers the period January-August 1955 and the rest the second half of 1954. Most of the articles have been reprinted from the inner-Party publications of provinces, municipalities or autonomous regions, some have been taken from newspapers, others are reports of Party committees or of working personnel to Party committees at higher levels, and one is a verbatim record of a talk by the director of a co-operative who was invited to Peking. We have made only a few verbal changes in the material, keeping intact the original contents. We have written comments on some of the articles. To keep our comments separate from those of the editors of the original publications, ours carry the designation "Editor's Note". We believe that the views of the authors as expressed in the material are correct or basically correct. From this material the reader will see the scope and direction of the co-operative movement in the country and the prospects for its development. The material shows that the movement is healthy. Troubles occurred only in places where the Party committees had failed to give proper guidance. But once they caught up and gave proper guidance according to the policy of the Central Committee of our Party, the problem was solved right away. The material is very convincing; it can rouse to action those who have so far adopted a passive attitude towards the movement; it can help those who still do not know how to run a co-operative to find ways to run it; what is more, it can silence those who are fond of "axing" co-operatives at will.

It is indeed a tremendous task to carry out the socialist transformation of agriculture among several hundred million peasants. The movement has not been going on very long in the country as a whole, and the experience gained is still inadequate. In particular we have not yet conducted extensive and effective propaganda throughout the Party; as a result, many comrades have paid no heed to the subject and do not understand the principles, policies and measures for the movement, and so there is still a lack of unity of will within the Party. The Sixth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of our Party is soon to be convened to discuss the subject and a new resolution on it will be adopted. We should start extensive and effective propaganda in accordance with the resolution so as to achieve unity of will throughout the Party. The publication of this book may be of some help to our propaganda work.

PREFACE II

December 27, 1941

This is a source book intended for people working in the countryside. A preface² was written for it in September. Now, three months later, that preface is already out of date, and so a new one has to be prepared.

Here is the sequence of events. The book has been compiled twice, in September and again in December. In the first compilation 121 articles were included. Most of them reflected conditions in the first half of 1955 and a few those in the second half of 1954. Sample copies were distributed for comment to responsible comrades from provincial, municipal, autonomous region and prefectural Party committees who attended the Sixth Plenary Session (Enlarged) of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, October 4-11, 1955. These comrades found the book needed to be supplemented. After the meeting most of the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions sent in additional material. Much of this reflected conditions in the second half of 1955. Thus the book had to be recompiled. From the original 121 articles we deleted 30, keeping 91, and added 85 from the new material, bringing the total to 176 articles — some 900,000 words. Hence the present collection. The comrades responsible for the editing have gone over all the material, made some verbal changes, added notes on

difficult terms and prepared a subject index. Furthermore, we have added comments on some of the articles, criticizing certain erroneous ideas or making certain suggestions. To keep our comments separate from those of the editors of the original publications, ours carry the designation "Editor's Note". Since some of our comments were written in September and others in December, there is naturally some variation in tone.

However, what is involved is not just the material. The point is that the situation in China underwent a fundamental change in the second half of 1955. Of China's 110 million peasant households more than 70 million (over 60 per cent) have up to now (late December 1955) joined semi-socialist agricultural producers' co-operatives in response to the call of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. In my report of July 31, 1955 on the co-operative transformation of agriculture, I put the number of peasant households in co-operatives at 16,900,000, but in the space of a few months that number has been exceeded by well over 50 million. This is a tremendous event. This event makes it clear to us that we need only the calendar year 1956 in order basically to complete the semi-socialist co-operative transformation of agriculture. In another three or four years, that is, by 1959 or 1960, we can in the main complete the transformation of semi-socialist co-operatives into fully socialist ones. This event makes it clear to us that we must try to accomplish the socialist transformation of China's handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce ahead of schedule in order to meet the needs of an expanding agriculture. And this event makes it clear to us that in scale and tempo China's industrialization and the development of its science, culture, education, health work, etc. can no longer proceed exactly in the way previously envisaged, but must be appropriately expanded and accelerated.

Is agricultural co-operation, now proceeding at such a high tempo, going forward in a healthy way? It certainly is. The Party organizations everywhere are giving over-all leadership to the movement. The peasants are taking part in the movement whole-heartedly and in excellent order. Their enthusiasm for production is rising to unprecedented heights. For the first time the broadest masses know clearly what the future has in store for them. When three five-year plans are completed, that is, by 1967, the production of grain and many other crops will probably double or treble the highest annual output before the founding of the People's Republic. In a relatively short time, say seven or eight years, illiteracy will be wiped out. Many of the

diseases most harmful to the people, such as schistosomiasis, diseases formerly considered incurable, can now be treated. In short, the masses already see a great future lying before them.

The problem facing the whole Party and people is no longer that of criticizing Right conservative ideas about the speed of the socialist transformation of agriculture. That problem has been solved. Nor is it the problem of the speed of transforming the whole of capitalist industry and commerce trade by trade into joint state-private enterprises. That problem too has been solved. The speed of the socialist transformation of handicrafts should be discussed during the first half of 1956. And that problem can also be easily solved. The problem today concerns none of these, it lies elsewhere. It lies in agricultural production; industrial production (including state, joint state-private and co-operative industries); handicraft production; the scale and speed of capital construction in industry, communications and transport; the co-ordination of commerce with other branches of the economy; the co-ordination of the work in science, culture, education and health with our various economic activities, etc. In all these fields there is an underestimation of the situation, a shortcoming which must be criticized and corrected if our work is to keep pace with the development of the situation as a whole. People must adapt their thinking to the changed conditions. Of course, no one should disregard reality and indulge in flights of fancy, or make plans of action unwarranted by the objective situation, or reach out for the impossible. However, the problem today is that Right conservative thinking is still causing trouble in many spheres and prevents our work from keeping pace with the development of the objective situation. The problem today is that what can be done by a measure of exertion is considered by many to be impossible. It is therefore entirely necessary to continue the criticism of Right conservative ideas, which do in fact exist.

This book is intended for comrades working in the countryside. Can city people read it too? They not only can but should. Here is something fresh. Just as new things are happening every day, every hour, in the building of socialism in the cities, so they are in the countryside. What are the peasants doing? What is the connection between what the peasants are doing and what the working class, the intellectuals and all patriotic personages are doing? To gain such an understanding, it will be helpful to read about the rural areas.

To make it possible for more people to understand the current situation in the countryside, we are preparing an abridged edition,

containing 44 of the 176 articles, or about 270,000 words, so that those unable to read the entire collection can have some idea of this subject.

NOTES

¹ The book was renamed *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside* when it was published.

² This refers to "Preface I".

EDITOR'S NOTES FROM *SOCIALIST UPSURGE* IN CHINA'S COUNTRYSIDE

September and December 1955

1

This is a very well written article which deserves to be recommended to the reader as the first piece in this book. As described at the beginning of the article, in many parts of the country there are still quite a few people who are “steering clear of the co-op” because they are ignorant about it and are afraid of being asked questions. “Resolute contraction”, the wholesale dissolution of co-operatives by command, is likewise a manifestation of “steering clear of the co-op”; the only difference is that, instead of taking a passive attitude of evasion, these people take a very active attitude and “axe” (to use their own expression) a great many co-operatives with one fell blow. Axe in hand, they chop and thus avoid troublesome problems. They say that there are all sorts of difficulties in running co-operatives, and according to them the difficulties defy the imagination. However, there are countless examples throughout the country which give the lie to their arguments. One such example is the experience of Tsunhua County, Hopei Province. In 1952 no one there knew how to run a co-operative. Their solution was to learn how. Their slogan was: “The Party secretary pitches in and all Party members help run the co-ops.” The result was: “from knowing nothing to knowing a lot”,

In editing *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*, Comrade Mao Tsetung wrote notes, of which 43 have been selected here. At the enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party held in Chengtu in March 1958, part of the notes was reprinted. On March 19, 1958 Comrade Mao Tsetung wrote an explanation, the full text of which reads:

These notes which appeared in the book entitled *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside* were written in September and December 1955. To this day some have not lost their significance. There is however one statement in the notes to

“from a few knowing how to many knowing how”, “from district cadres running the co-ops to the masses running them”. In the three years from 1952 to 1954, the eleven townships of the Tenth District, Tsunhua County, Hopei Province, basically completed semi-socialist co-operative transformation, with 85 per cent of the 4,343 peasant households drawn into co-operatives. Compared with 1952, production in agriculture, forestry and animal husbandry in this district showed the following increases in 1954: grain 76 per cent, timber trees 56.4 per cent, fruit trees 62.87 per cent and sheep 463.1 per cent.

Now we have every reason to raise this question: if this could be done here, why can't it be done elsewhere? If you say it can't, what are your reasons? I can see only one reason — unwillingness to take the trouble, or, to put it more bluntly, Right opportunism. Hence “steering clear of the co-op”, hence the Party secretary not pitching in and all Party members not helping to run the co-operatives, and hence from knowing nothing to still knowing nothing, from a few knowing how to still only a few knowing how, from district cadres running the co-operatives to still only district cadres running them. Or else, axe in hand, chopping down any troublesome co-operative in sight. If that reason prevails, then nothing can be accomplished. We have put forward such slogans as “active leadership and steady advance” and “comprehensive planning and more effective leadership”, and we agree with the perfectly correct slogan raised by the comrades of Tsunhua County, “The Party secretary pitches in and all Party members help run the co-ops.” Hasn't there been “active leadership and steady advance” in Tsunhua County? Hasn't there been “comprehensive planning and more effective leadership”? Of course there has. Is this dangerous? Is this “rash advance”? Such danger as exists lies in “steering clear of the co-op”, and this has been overcome by the Tsunhua County comrades. The danger also lies in “axing” co-operatives wholesale on the pretext of opposing “rash advance”, but this did not happen in Tsunhua County. If, as is alleged, “the development of the co-operatives has gone beyond the level of political

the effect that 1955 was the year in which socialism won basic victory in the decisive battle with capitalism; it is not proper to put it that way. This is the way it should be put: 1955 was the year in which basic victory was won as regards the aspect of ownership in the relations of production, while in the other aspects of the relations of production as well as in some aspects of the superstructure, namely, on the ideological and political fronts, either a basic victory was not won or, if won, the victory was not complete, and further efforts were required. We did not anticipate that such a great storm would burst upon the world in 1956, nor did

consciousness of the masses and the ability of the cadres to lead”, how can one explain what happened in Tsunhua County? There the masses actually pressed for co-operation, there the cadres did change from knowing nothing to knowing a lot. Everybody has eyes, does anyone see any danger in Tsunhua County? In the three years in which they completed co-operative transformation step by step, grain increased by 76 per cent, timber trees by 56.4 per cent, fruit trees by 62.87 per cent and sheep by 463.1 per cent. Can this be considered any kind of danger? Can this be called “rash advance”? Can this be regarded as “having gone beyond the level of political consciousness of the masses and the ability of the cadres to lead”?

In the Tsunhua County co-operative movement there is the Wang Kuo-fan Co-operative, once known as a “paupers’ co-op” because its twenty-three poor peasant households owned only “three legs” of a donkey. Relying on their own efforts, its members “made the mountains yield”¹ a substantial amount of the means of production in three years, a feat which moved not a few visitors to tears. This, in my view, is the image of our entire nation. Why can’t 600 million “paupers” create a prosperous and strong socialist country in several decades by their own efforts? Society’s wealth is created by workers, peasants and working intellectuals. Provided they take their destiny into their own hands, provided they have a Marxist-Leninist line and energetically tackle problems instead of evading them, they can overcome any difficulty on earth.

Finally, we wish to thank the author of this article which carries no byline. Brimming with enthusiasm and writing in a lively style, he gives a detailed description of the process of the co-operative transformation of agriculture in one district. This will be no small contribution to co-operative transformation in the whole country. We hope every province, prefecture and county can produce one or more such articles.

(Note to “The Party Secretary Pitches In and All Party Members Help Run the Co-ops”)

we anticipate that a campaign to “oppose rash advance” would occur in the same year in our country, a campaign which dampened the enthusiasm of the masses. Both events gave a considerable stimulus to the Rightists in mounting their wild attacks. Hence a lesson can be drawn: neither socialist revolution nor socialist construction is plain sailing, and we should be prepared to cope with the many great difficulties that may crop up at home and abroad. Both internationally and domestically the general situation is favourable, we can be sure of this, but many serious difficulties are bound to occur and we must be prepared to tackle them.

2

For many people in China 1955 has been a year of shattered illusions. In the first half of the year many still clung tenaciously to their own beliefs on certain questions. But by the second half, they could no longer do so and had to believe in the new. Examples follow: They held that "co-operative transformation in three years" as demanded by the masses was only an idle dream; that co-operation could be achieved more quickly in the north but not in the south; that it was impossible to run co-operatives in backward townships, in mountain areas, in minority nationality areas, in areas populated by several nationalities or in areas stricken by natural calamities; that it was easy to set up a co-operative but hard to consolidate it; that the peasants were too poor and had no way of raising funds; that the peasants were illiterate and bookkeepers were not available; that more co-operatives meant more troubles; that the development of the co-operatives had gone beyond the level of political consciousness of the masses and the experience of the cadres; that the Party's policy of state monopoly for the purchase and marketing of grain and its policy on co-operation were dampening the peasants' enthusiasm for production; that unless the Communist Party backed down immediately on the question of co-operation, it would be running the risk of breaking up the worker-peasant alliance; that co-operative transformation would produce a vast pool of surplus labour-power for which there would be no outlet. And many more examples of the kind could be cited. In a word, these were all illusions. All of them were shattered after being criticized by the Sixth Plenary Session (Enlarged) of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in October 1955. A high tide of socialist transformation is sweeping through the rural areas, and the masses are jubilant. This has been a profound lesson for all Communists. The masses have such a vast reservoir of socialist enthusiasm, but why was it that many of the leading organizations could be so insensitive or only barely sensitive to this a few months ago? Why was there such a difference between what was on the minds of some leaders and what was on the minds of the masses? Taking this as a lesson, how should one handle similar cases and problems in the future? There is only one answer. Don't divorce yourselves

from the masses; instead learn to discern the enthusiasm of the masses in its essence.

(Note to "A 'Backward' Village Is Not Necessarily Backward in Every Respect")

3

All those who believe it impossible for each individual area to achieve lower-stage co-operative transformation in three years (co-operation in three years was the slogan raised by the masses but criticized by the opportunists) and all those who believe it impossible for the areas liberated later to go co-operative at the same time as those liberated earlier, please take a good look at this township in Kunshan County, Kiangsu Province! Here, co-operative transformation took not three years but two. It is not an old liberated area but a 100 per cent new liberated area. And it is running ahead of many of the old liberated areas. What can you do about it? Pull it back? Of course not. The opportunists just have to admit defeat. The masses have a vast reservoir of enthusiasm for socialism. Those who know no better than to keep to the old routine even in times of revolution are utterly incapable of seeing this enthusiasm. They are blind and all is dark ahead of them. At times they go so far as to confound right and wrong and turn things upside down. Haven't we come across enough of such people? Only knowing how to keep to the old routine, they invariably underestimate the people's enthusiasm. Let something new appear and they always disapprove and immediately oppose it. Later they admit defeat and do a little self-criticism. The next time something new appears, they again go through the same process, one attitude alternating with the other. And this is the way they will behave in regard to everything new. Such people are always passive in that at the critical moment they stand still and have to be given a hard shove in the back before they take a step forward. Just how long will it be before such people can manage to move of their own accord and walk properly? There is a cure for those who have this kind of ailment: take some time out and go among the masses, learn what they are thinking about, see what they are doing, and find out their advanced experience and spread

it. This is an effective prescription for chronic Right opportunism, and those so afflicted are advised to give it a try.

(Note to "This Township Goes Co-operative in Two Years")

4

This is a good article. Reading it one can see that the Uighur peasants are very eager to take the road of co-operation. They have already trained the cadres they need for semi-socialist co-operative transformation. Some people claim that co-operation cannot succeed among the minority nationalities. This is not so. We have seen quite a few co-operatives run either separately by the Mongolian, Hui, Uighur, Miao, Chuang and other minority nationalities or jointly by people of several nationalities, and they are all very successful. This fact refutes the erroneous views of those who look down on the minority nationalities.

(Note to "Township and Village Cadres Are Capable of Giving Leadership to the Formation of Co-operatives")

5

This is an excellent article which will convince many people. The Party organization here has never wavered on the question of co-operation. It stood four-square behind the badly-off peasants in their demand for organizing a co-operative, with the result that they won out in their competition with the well-to-do middle peasants, developed a small co-operative into a big one and increased production each year, and that the whole village went co-operative in less than three years. The well-to-do middle peasants had jeered, "Imagine, those paupers think they can set up a co-op. Never heard of chicken feathers flying up to heaven." And yet the chicken feathers have done just that. This is a struggle between the two roads — socialism versus capitalism. In China, the rich peasant economy is very weak (that portion of the rich peasants' land operated in a semi-feudal way was requisitioned during agrarian reform, most of the old rich peasants no longer hire labour, and socially they are very much discredited), but the

well-to-do and fairly well-to-do middle peasants who constitute 20 to 30 per cent of the rural population are quite strong. An important aspect of the struggle between the two roads in China's countryside manifests itself in the peaceful competition of the poor and lower-middle peasants with the well-to-do middle peasants. Who can increase production within two or three years, the well-to-do middle peasants working on their own, or the poor and lower-middle peasants working together in co-operatives? In the beginning, the competition was between a number of poor and lower-middle peasants organized in co-operatives and the well-to-do middle peasants working on their own, with most of the poor and lower-middle peasants looking on; it was a contest between the two sides to win over the masses. Behind the well-to-do middle peasants were landlords and rich peasants, who gave them support, sometimes openly, sometimes secretly. On the side of the co-operatives stood the Communist Party members, who should be as firm in their support for the co-operatives as were the Communists in Nantsuichuang Village, Anyang County. It's a pity that not all the rural Party branches were so firm. And where they were not, confusion arose. First of all, there was the question of public opinion on whether chicken feathers could fly up to heaven. It is of course a question of great importance. In thousands of years, who had ever seen chicken feathers flying up to heaven? That they could not seemed a truism. Many a poor or lower-middle peasant would have been confused if the Party had not refuted this truism. Secondly, as for cadres and, thirdly, as for such material resources as loans, the co-operatives would have run into great difficulties if the Party and the state had not come to their aid. The well-to-do middle peasants dared to spread such hoary truisms as "chicken feathers can't fly up to heaven" because the co-operatives had not increased their output, the poor co-operatives had not become rich ones, and the co-operatives had not grown in number from a few isolated ones to tens and hundreds of thousands. They dared to do so because the Party had not yet conducted vigorous nation-wide propaganda about the advantages of co-operation and because the Party had not yet pointed out in clear-cut terms that the hoary truism "chicken feathers can't fly up to heaven" no longer holds good in the era of socialism. The poor are turning their past upside down. The old system is dying, a new system is being born. Chicken feathers really are flying up to heaven. In the Soviet Union, this has already happened. In China, it is happening now. And it is going to happen all over the world. Many of our local Party organizations were

not solely to blame for failing to give strong backing to the badly-off peasants because, higher up, opportunist ideas had not yet been dealt mortal blows, comprehensive plans had not been made to promote co-operative transformation and more effective leadership had not been given to the movement on a national scale. In 1955 we did all this and in the space of a few months the situation changed completely. Onlookers before, large numbers of people now came over in groups to the side of the co-operatives. The well-to-do middle peasants also changed their tune. Some applied to join the co-operatives and others were getting ready to do so. Even the most stubborn among them no longer dared talk about whether chicken feathers could fly up to heaven. The landlords and rich peasants were completely deflated. The fact that the People's Government punished a number of counter-revolutionaries who had disrupted public order and tried to sabotage the co-operative transformation also played a part here. In short, in the second half of 1955, a fundamental change took place in the balance of class forces in our country: socialism soared and capitalism plunged. Given another year of hard work in 1956, the foundation will have been basically laid for the socialist transformation in the transition period.

(Note to "Who Says Chicken Feathers Can't Fly Up to Heaven?")

6

The almost ubiquitous Right opportunists inside the Party who hinder the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants from taking the road of co-operation act in concert with the forces of capitalism in our society. This article gives an apt description of the situation. The author lashes out with great indignation at the opportunists and champions those peasants who are badly off. Some people are supposed to be Communists, but they show hardly any interest in the socialist tasks that have to be undertaken now. Instead of supporting the enthusiastic masses, they pour cold water on them. Nineteen fifty-five has been the decisive year for the struggle between socialism and capitalism in China. The decisive battle unfolded first of all in the three conferences called in May, July and October by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. In the first half of 1955

the atmosphere was foul and dark clouds threatened. But in the second half of the year there has been a complete change and the climate is entirely different; in response to the call of the Central Committee tens of millions of peasant households have swung into action and gone co-operative. At the time the editor is writing these lines, over sixty million peasant households have joined co-operatives all over the country. This is a raging tidal wave sweeping away all demons and monsters. People of all sorts in our society have been clearly revealed for what they are. It is the same in the Party. By the end of this year the victory of socialism will be largely assured. Of course, many more battles lie ahead and further efforts must be made to carry on the fight.

(Note to "The Ill Wind of Opportunism Is Dying, the Fair Wind of Socialism Is Rising")

7

This is an interesting article too. Opportunists trying to stem the tide are found almost everywhere, but the tide can never be stemmed, and socialism is advancing triumphantly everywhere, sweeping away all obstacles. Society progresses daily in this way and people's thinking is transformed in the process, particularly when there is an upsurge in the revolution.

(Note to "The Workers' Families Are Very Keen on the Co-operative Movement")

8

This article tells a moving story. We hope the reader will go through it carefully. Those comrades who do not believe the peasant masses are eager to take the socialist road and those comrades who are only too ready to pick up the axe to "chop" the co-operatives are particularly urged to do so. Throughout the countryside the socialist factors are growing daily and hourly, the peasant masses are pressing to form co-operatives and large numbers of intelligent, capable, fair-minded

and enthusiastic leaders are emerging from among the people; this is a very heartening situation indeed. The most serious failing is that in many places the Party leaders have not bestirred themselves to keep pace. Our present task is to get the local Party committees at various levels to take the initiative on this matter in conformity with the Marxist-Leninist stand, assume full responsibility for agricultural co-operation and lead the movement forward with enthusiasm, warm responsiveness and drive. The story of Lord Yeh who professed to love dragons should not be repeated, one must not just talk about socialism for years and then suddenly turn pale when socialism comes knocking at the door.

(Note to "A Co-operative Set Up Spontaneously by the Masses Against the Wishes of the Leadership")

9

The correct line is being followed in this township, which already has five agricultural producers' co-operatives, seven combined mutual-aid teams, three permanent mutual-aid teams and fourteen temporary mutual-aid teams. This means the total membership amounts to 98.4 per cent of the peasant households which ought to be organized. Before December 1954, this township Party branch did not lay stress on the mutual-aid and co-operative movement in exercising its leadership, and Party members were afraid of difficulties in leading the mutual-aid teams. Instead of "the Party secretary pitching in and all Party members helping run the co-ops", this Party branch leaned on the work team (apparently sent from above). In the whole country, there are quite a few rural Party branches just as weak and incompetent on the question of agricultural co-operation. Apart from these Party branches, it is quite possible that some of the higher Party committees are also in this state. There's the rub. Whether the socialist transformation of agriculture can keep pace with the industrialization of the country and whether the co-operative movement can develop in a healthy way with a minimum of shortcomings and a guaranteed increase in production depends on whether the local Party committees at various levels can quickly and correctly shift the emphasis of their leadership to agricultural co-operation. Work

teams should be sent in, but it must be made clear that they are there only to help the local Party organizations, not to take their place and render them idle and completely dependent. This township in Kweichow Province achieved remarkable success in only a little over five months after the leadership changed its approach to work in December 1954. Instead of being dependent on the work team, they pitched in themselves, and Party members stopped being afraid of difficulties. A change of this sort depends first and foremost on the secretaries of the Party committees at all levels — province and autonomous region, prefecture and autonomous prefecture, county and autonomous county, and district — as well as on the Party branch secretaries; they themselves must assume full responsibility for agricultural co-operation. To be afraid of trouble and difficulties and to refuse to pitch in when confronted with this great task but instead simply to pass it on to the Party's rural work departments or to the work teams — such an attitude will not only make it impossible to accomplish the task but will also cause a great deal of trouble.

(Note to “How Chunghsin Township, Fengkang County Launched the Mutual-Aid and Co-operative Movement Under the Leadership of the Party Branch”)

10

The author of this article says it was after a joint meeting of co-operative directors in the county that this co-operative developed the practice of seasonal contracts from that of occasional contracts. From this one can see that county leadership is very important. We hope that the leading body in each of China's well over two thousand counties will closely watch the development of its co-operative movement, identify the problems, work out solutions to them, call timely meetings of the directors of all its co-operatives or of selected ones, make decisions and carry them out quickly. Don't wait until problems pile up and cause a lot of trouble before you tackle them. Leaders must be in the van of the movement, not lag behind it. Within each county, it is the county Party committee that should play the main role in giving leadership.

(Note to “Contracts on a Seasonal Basis”)

11

This material is very convincing. Healthy co-operative transformation in a locality depends on the Party's policies and methods of work. If our Party's policies for co-operative transformation are correct, if its method of work in mobilizing the masses to join co-operatives is not high-handed or simplistic, but one of explaining and analysing things to the masses and relying entirely on their initiative and willingness, then it should not be very difficult to achieve co-operative transformation and raise output. Tungchuankou Village, Hsingtai County, Hopei Province, lies in an old liberated area. Before 1952 the seventy households in the village had all joined mutual-aid teams and they had a strong Party branch and in Wang Chih-chi a leader who enjoyed the trust of the masses. All the conditions were ripe. So in 1952 the village organized a co-operative, accomplishing semi-socialist co-operative transformation in barely over a month. What about places where conditions are not as ripe as in this village? Then it is a question of creating the conditions and this can be done in a few months, a year, or a little longer. The required conditions can be created while the work is being carried on. To set up a few small co-operatives is to create the conditions for the co-operative transformation of the whole village, the whole township and the whole district. This material about Tungchuankou also explains at length how a Party branch should conduct propaganda and education among the masses and how it should rely on the initiative and willingness of the masses themselves to establish co-operatives. The method of "reverse propaganda"² used in this village is well worth paying attention to. The material describes how the co-operative traversed a zigzag course in tackling the problems of organizing and supervising labour and went on to achieve great success in increasing production from year to year. Facts have proved that this co-operative is sound. The main criterion by which every co-operative judges whether it is sound is to see whether its production is rising and by how much.

(Note to "The Whole Village Goes Co-operative in Barely over a Month")

12

This material points to the truth that any co-operative in a state of confusion can be put in order. Since co-operative members are all

working peasants, whatever the differences among the various strata, they can be ironed out in the end. For a time there really was confusion in some co-operatives, solely because they got no leadership from the Party which did not explain its policies and measures to the masses. "We know it's a good thing to set up a co-op. But when we did set one up, nobody bothered about us, neither the county Party committee, nor the district Party committee, nor the local Party branch. Perhaps they didn't think much of our poor village, they couldn't eat and live well here, and so they never came our way." This, and this alone, accounts for such confusion as exists. Without leadership from the Party, confusion naturally arises. The moment leadership is given, confusion will end. This material also raises the question of whether co-operatives can be established in backward villages. The answer is "yes". The very co-operative the author describes lies in a backward village. Something like 5 per cent of China's villages are backward; we must set up co-operatives in all these villages and in the course of this struggle wipe out their backwardness.

(Note to "A Co-operative in a State of Confusion Is Put in Order")

13

This is a common but serious problem. Party committees at every level and comrades sent to guide the work of co-operative transformation in the rural areas should give it their full attention. It is imperative to establish the dominant position of the present-day poor peasants and the new lower-middle peasants in the leading body of a co-operative, with the old lower-middle peasants and the new and old upper-middle peasants as the auxiliary force; only thus can unity between the poor and the middle peasants be attained, the co-operatives be consolidated, production be expanded and socialist transformation in the entire countryside be correctly carried out in line with the Party's policy. In the absence of this condition, it is impossible to attain unity between the middle and the poor peasants, consolidate the co-operatives, expand production and achieve socialist transformation in the entire countryside. Many comrades fail to understand this point. They maintain that in the period of agrarian reform

it was necessary to establish the dominant position of the poor peasants, because the poor peasants, who then accounted for 50, or 60 to 70 per cent of the rural population, had not yet moved up to the status of middle peasants, while the middle peasants were wavering with regard to agrarian reform, and so the necessity was indeed real. They argue that we are now in the period of the socialist transformation of agriculture and most of the former poor peasants have become new middle peasants and that, moreover, the old middle peasants own plenty of the means of production and without their participation it is impossible for the co-operatives to cope with the shortage of the means of production. Therefore, these comrades maintain that we should no longer raise the slogan of relying on the poor peasants or establishing their dominant position and that this slogan is harmful to the co-operative movement. This view, we believe, is wrong. If the working class and the Communist Party are to bring about a thorough transformation of the small peasant private ownership of the means of production in the entire countryside in accordance with the socialist spirit and the socialist system, they can do so relatively smoothly only by relying on the masses of the poor peasants, the former semi-proletarians, otherwise it will be most difficult. For the rural semi-proletariat are not so stubborn in clinging to small peasant private ownership of the means of production; they are more ready to accept socialist transformation. Most of them have now become new middle peasants, but except for a section who have become well-to-do, the majority of the new middle peasants have a higher level of political consciousness than the old middle peasants, as they can easily recall their past misery. Then there are the old lower-middle peasants; in economic status and political attitude, they are more or less similar to the new lower-middle peasants but different from the new and old upper-middle peasants, *i.e.*, the well-to-do or fairly well-to-do middle peasants. Therefore, in the course of co-operative transformation we must pay attention to (1) the poor peasants, who are still in difficulty, (2) the new lower-middle peasants, and (3) the old lower-middle peasants — the three sections who are more ready to accept socialist transformation. They should be the first ones to be drawn into the co-operatives, batch by batch and stage by stage; a number of them with higher political consciousness and greater organizational ability should be selected and trained as the mainstay of the leadership of the co-operatives, and there should be special emphasis on selecting them from among the present-day poor peasants and the new

lower-middle peasants. This does not mean a new determination of class status is to be made in the rural areas; it is a policy to be carefully followed in the course of co-operative transformation by the Party branches and the comrades sent to the countryside to guide the work, and this policy should be publicly explained to the peasant masses. Nor do we mean to keep the well-to-do middle peasants out of the co-operatives; what we do mean is to admit them only when they have raised their socialist consciousness and are willing to join and accept the leadership of the poor peasants (including the present-day poor peasants and all the new lower-middle peasants who were formerly poor peasants), and not to set eyes on their oxen and farm implements and force them to join when they are unwilling. Those already in co-operatives may stay on if they wish. Those who have asked to withdraw but have been persuaded to change their minds may also stay on. Co-operatives can be organized even with scanty means of production, as has been proved by the many co-operatives organized by poor and lower-middle peasants. Furthermore, we do not mean that none of the well-to-do middle peasants should be allowed to serve as co-operative cadres. A few well-to-do middle peasants, who are well thought of by the majority of co-operative members for their higher level of socialist consciousness, fair-mindedness and competence, may serve as cadres. However, it is imperative to establish the dominant position of the poor peasants in the co-operatives (to repeat, they include the present-day poor peasants and all the new lower-middle peasants who were formerly poor peasants, and together they constitute the majority, or the overwhelming majority, of the rural population). As for the composition of the leading body, the poor peasants should account for some two-thirds, while the middle peasants (including the old lower-middle peasants and the new and old upper-middle peasants) should form about one-third, but no more. As for the guiding principle, the co-operatives must pursue policies beneficial to both the poor and the middle peasants and not harmful to the interests of either. For this purpose, too, it is necessary to establish the dominant position of the poor peasants. In co-operatives where the middle peasants occupy the dominant position, the poor peasants are usually pushed aside and their interests violated. The experience of Kaoshan Township, Changsha County, Hunan Province, fully shows that it is imperative and possible to establish the dominant position of the poor peasants and thereby firmly to unite with the middle peasants, and how dangerous it can be if this

is not done. The author of this article thoroughly understands the Party line. And the procedure is also a correct one, that is, first of all fulfilling the urgent task of increasing production and then establishing the dominant position of the poor peasants in the leadership. As a result, the poor peasants did themselves proud and the middle peasants were impressed too. The author also tells us something very important. Is it better to dissolve a co-operative that is in a state of confusion or give it a good shake-up and help it to get out of the confusion and on to a sound basis? Is it possible to put such a co-operative in order and consolidate it? He very convincingly tells us that instead of dissolving Class III co-operatives we should set about putting them in order. After such an effort, it is entirely possible for Class III co-operatives to become Class I co-operatives. This experience is shared by many other places in the country and is not peculiar to Kaoshan Township, Changsha County.

(Note to "How the Dominant Position Passed from the Middle Peasants to the Poor Peasants in the Wutang Agricultural Producers' Co-operative of Kaoshan Township, Changsha County")

14

The problem discussed here is of general significance. It is essential to unite with the middle peasants, and it is wrong not to do so. But who should the working class and the Communist Party rely on in the rural areas in order to unite with the middle peasants and achieve socialist transformation in the entire countryside? Surely none other than the poor peasants. That was the case in the past when the struggle was waged against the landlords to carry out agrarian reform, and that is the case today when the struggle is being waged against the rich peasants and other capitalist elements to achieve the socialist transformation of agriculture. In both these revolutionary periods the middle peasants wavered in the initial stage. Only when the middle peasants see clearly which way the wind is blowing and only when victory in the revolution is within sight will they come in on the side of the revolution. The poor peasants have to work on the middle peasants and win them over, so that the revolution will broaden from day to day until final victory is achieved. The management committees of the agricultural producers' co-operatives today, like the peasant associations in the

past, must draw in the old lower-middle peasants and a number of the new and old upper-middle peasants who are representative of this stratum and have a relatively high level of political consciousness, but there should not be too many of them on the committee, one-third is about the right proportion. The other two-thirds should be poor peasants (including the present-day poor peasants and the new lower-middle peasants who were formerly poor peasants). Generally speaking, the key posts in the co-operative should be held by the poor peasants (to repeat, including the present-day poor peasants and all the new lower-middle peasants who were formerly poor peasants), but such posts may also be filled by old lower-middle peasants and some of the new and old upper-middle peasants who have a high level of political consciousness and are really fair-minded and competent. In Fuan County, Fukien Province, a co-operative led by the poor peasants and another led by the middle peasants take different attitudes towards the cause of socialism; this is true everywhere and should not be regarded as an isolated phenomenon.

(Note to "A Lesson Drawn from the Existence of a 'Middle Peasants' Co-operative' Side by Side with a 'Poor Peasants' Co-operative' in Fuan County")

15

This material is useful and worth general attention. It describes the trends among the various strata in the countryside. The poor peasants are the most enthusiastic about co-operative transformation. Many middle peasants want to "wait and see for a while" and would like to "stay outside and be free", mainly because they want to find out whether they would get a bad bargain if they invested their means of production in the co-operatives; they can swing either way. Many well-to-do middle peasants have strong feelings against co-operation; the worst among them sell off their means of production, spirit their money away, or rig up fake co-operatives, and a few even gang up with landlords and rich peasants. We hope that all the comrades engaged in rural work will carefully observe and analyse the trends among the various strata in their localities so as to adopt policies suited to the circumstances. This material mentions the mistaken tendency of paying attention to the co-operatives to the neglect of the mutual-aid teams and recommends

over-all planning and all-round consideration, and this is correct. The "network of mutual aid and co-operation" is a good idea, which takes into consideration both the co-operatives and the mutual-aid teams, with the co-operatives providing real help to the mutual-aid teams and peasants working on their own in solving their current production difficulties. The poor peasants' fund must be made available to the villages at once. Those poor peasants who have not yet joined the co-operatives should be told that they can draw on this fund whenever they join.

(Note to "New Situation and New Problems")

16

The policy of this co-operative is correct. All co-operatives should do the same. In their resolutions or directives on the question of co-operative transformation, the provinces should point out that it is the responsibility of all co-operatives to help solve the difficulties of the widows, orphans and other members without a provider, who have no labour-power (it was right to admit such people), and also of those members who have labour-power but are suffering great hardship. At present there are quite a number of co-operatives in which the socialist spirit of helping needy families is lacking and from which the poor peasants are even excluded; this is utterly wrong. The government has now set up a poor peasants' fund which can help them solve the problems of oxen and farm implements but cannot as yet solve the problems of some poor peasant families short of labour-power, or solve entirely the problems of some other families short of food before the new harvest. These problems can be solved only by relying on the strength of the masses in the co-operatives.

(Note to "The Party Branch of Chingfeng Township, Hsiangtan County, Helps Badly-off Co-operative Members Tide Over Their Difficulties")

17

This is a very interesting story. Socialism, which is new, comes into being only through severe struggle against what is old. At one

time, a section of society is very stubborn in following a set routine. At another, the very same people are quite capable of changing their attitude and favouring the new. In the first half of 1955 most of the well-to-do middle peasants were still opposed to co-operation, but in the second half a number of them changed their minds and expressed a desire to join the co-operatives, although some did so because they hoped to obtain the leadership of the co-operatives. Another group wavered a great deal, they said they wanted to join, but at heart they were reluctant. A third group were obdurate and still wanted to wait and see. On this matter the rural Party organizations should be patient with this stratum and give them time. In order to establish the dominant position of the poor and new lower-middle peasants in the leading bodies, it may well prove to be an advantage if some of the well-to-do middle peasants join the co-operatives a little later.

(Note to "They Firmly Choose the Road of Co-operation")



Political work is the life-blood of all economic work. This is particularly true at a time when the social and economic system is undergoing fundamental change. From the start, the agricultural co-operative movement has been a severe ideological and political struggle. No co-operative can be established without going through such a struggle. Before a new social system can be built on the site of the old, the site must be swept clean. Remnant old ideas reflecting the old system invariably persist in people's minds for a long time, and they do not easily give way. Having been established, a co-operative must go through many more struggles before it can be consolidated. Even then, it may collapse if efforts are relaxed. A case in point is the Sanlouszu Co-operative in Hsiehyu County, Shansi Province, which nearly collapsed for lack of sustained effort after it had been consolidated. Not until the Party branch of the co-operative had criticized its own errors, resumed education for socialism and against capitalism among the co-operative members and revived its political work was the crisis overcome and the co-operative able to grow again. To oppose spontaneous tendencies towards capitalism which is characterized by selfishness and to foster the socialist spirit which postulates the principle

of integrating collective interest with individual interest as the criterion for judging all words and deeds — these are the ideological and political guarantees for the gradual transition from a scattered small peasant economy to a large-scale co-operative economy. This entails doing an enormous amount of hard work, not in a crude and oversimplified way, but concretely and painstakingly in the light of the peasants' own experience. It should proceed together with and not apart from economic work. We now have fairly rich experience in this kind of work on a national scale. This is shown in almost every article in this book.

(Note to "A Serious Lesson")

19

The viewpoint of this article is correct. Co-operatives must stress doing political work well. The basic requirement of political work is constantly to imbue the peasant masses with a socialist ideology and to criticize capitalist tendencies.

(Note to "Political Work in the Changkuochuang Co-operative")

20

This situation merits attention. There are serious tendencies towards capitalism among the well-to-do peasants. These tendencies will become rampant if we in the slightest way neglect political work among the peasants not only during the co-operative transformation but also for a very long period afterwards.

(Note to "Wage a Resolute Struggle Against Capitalist Tendencies")

21

This is a very good account of how to consolidate a co-operative and should be recommended. The birth of a new social system is

invariably accompanied by cheering and shouting, that is to say, by propagating the superiority of the new system and criticizing the backwardness of the old. It is impossible to carry out in an atmosphere of tranquillity such an earth-shaking task as getting some 500 million Chinese peasants to undertake socialist transformation; therefore it behoves us Communists to conduct patient, lively and easily understandable propaganda and education among the peasant masses who are weighed down with the burdens of the old system. This is now being done in every part of the country and many of the comrades engaged in rural work have proved themselves good propagandists. The method described in this article, "make four comparisons and five calculations",³ is a fine one for explaining to the peasants, in terms easy to understand, which system is good and which bad. It has great powers of persuasion. It is quite unlike the method of those comrades who are not so good at propaganda work and can produce nothing convincing but merely say, "Either you follow the road of the Communist Party, or you follow the road of Chiang Kai-shek," thus trying to subdue their audience by threatening to stick labels on them. It is a method that draws on the local peasants' own experience and provides them with a detailed analysis; hence its great powers of persuasion.

(Note to "Good Experience in Consolidating a Co-operative")

Sabotage of the co-operative movement by counter-revolutionaries is a common occurrence and not limited to the Fifth District of Tuyun County, Kweichow Province, but very little is written about it in similar publications in other provinces. In the course of co-operative transformation, all comrades engaged in rural work must pay full attention to the struggle against counter-revolutionary wrecking activities. As in this district in Tuyun County, security units with Party and Youth League members as the mainstay should be set up within the co-operatives. It is absolutely necessary for the district Party committee, led and supervised by the county Party committee, to study the situation, carry out propaganda and explain things to people inside and outside the Party, alert the masses to counter-revolutionary wrecking activities,

and then investigate, clear out and punish the counter-revolutionaries and other bad elements who have wormed their way into the leading bodies of the co-operatives. However, those to be cleared out must be confirmed counter-revolutionaries and bad elements; good persons or persons merely with certain shortcomings must not be labelled bad elements. In particular, punishment must be appropriate and has to be approved by the county authorities.

(Note to "Wage a Resolute Struggle Against Counter-Revolutionary Sabotage")

23

In order to build a great socialist society it is most important to mobilize the masses of women to join in productive activity. In production men and women must receive equal pay for equal work. Genuine equality between the sexes can only be realized in the process of the socialist transformation of society as a whole.

(Note to "Women Are Now on the Labour Front")

24

This is an excellent article which can serve as reference material for all localities. Young people are the most active and dynamic force in society. They are the most eager to learn and the least conservative in their thinking, and this is especially true in the era of socialism. We hope that the Party organizations in all places, working in concert with the Youth League organizations, will pay particular attention to bringing the energy of our youth into full play, and not just take them for granted and ignore their characteristics. Of course, the young should learn from the older people and try as far as possible to win their agreement for doing useful things. Older people are more encumbered with conservative ideas and often restrain the progressive activities of the young; they will not be convinced until the young people make a success of something. All this is very well described in

the article. Naturally, there should be no compromise with conservative ideas. Well then, let's have a try at it, and if it works, they'll agree.

(Note to "The Youth Shock Brigade of the Ninth Agricultural Producers' Co-operative in Hsinping Township, Chungshan County")

25

Here is another good article which can serve as reference material for all localities. It mentions organizing the participation of middle school students and primary school graduates in the co-operative movement. This is especially noteworthy. All such educated young people who can go and work in the countryside should be glad to do so. The countryside is a big world where much can be accomplished.

(Note to "Experience in Planning Co-operative Transformation in a Township")

26

Here is another one, Chen Hsueh-meng. In China, such heroes are legion, but it is a pity that our writers do not seek them out, and as for those people who go to the countryside to guide the co-operative movement, they see a lot but write very little.

(Note to "Chen Hsueh-meng, Pace-Setter in Co-operative Transformation")

27

This very well written article deserves to be recommended to all Party and Youth League committees at the county and district levels and to all township Party and Youth League branches. All co-operatives should follow the example described. The author understands the Party line and hits the nail on the head. The language is good, the article is easy to read and does not smack of stereotyped Party writing. Here

we should like to call the reader's attention to the fact that many of our comrades are addicted to stereotyped Party writing and that the articles they turn out are not lively, not vivid, and give the reader a headache. They care little for syntax or diction, and they fancy a style that is a cross between the literary and the colloquial, at times verbose and rambling, at times elliptical and archaic, as though they were out to torment the reader. Quite a number of the more than 170 articles selected for this book reeked heavily of stereotyped Party writing. Only after repeated polishing were they made fairly readable. Even so, a few remain rather obscure and hard to understand. They have been included only for their content. How much longer will it be before we read less of this stereotyped Party writing which gives us such headaches? It is up to those comrades who work as editors on our newspapers and periodicals to pay attention to this matter, ask their contributors to write coherently and vividly, and take it upon themselves to polish the manuscripts.

(Note to "Political Work in the Co-operatives")

28

The co-operative introduced here is the "paupers' co-op" led by Wang Kuo-fan. Diligence and thrift ought to be the principle for managing all our agricultural producers' co-operatives, nay, all our economic enterprises. Diligence and thrift should be practised in running factories, stores and all state-owned, co-operative and other enterprises; this principle should be observed in doing everything. It is the principle of practising economy, one of the basic principles of socialist economy. China is a big country but it is still very poor, and it will take several decades to make China prosperous. Even then the principle of diligence and thrift will still have to be observed, but it is in the coming decades, in the span of several five-year plans, that diligence and thrift must be particularly stressed and special attention paid to practising economy. At present, many co-operatives pay little attention to practising economy; this is an unhealthy tendency which should be immediately corrected. Co-operatives run with diligence and thrift can be found in every province and county, and these examples should be publicized for all to follow. Those co-operatives which are industrious and thrifty, get the highest yields and do well in all respects should be commended,

whereas those which are wasteful, get very low yields and do poorly in all respects should be criticized.

(Note to "Run the Co-operative with Diligence and Thrift")

29

This is a long-range seven-year plan for a large co-operative (they call it a collective farm, that is, a co-operative) which will embrace the township's thousand or so households. The plan can serve as reference material for all localities. People will understand the need for this kind of long-term plan after they have gone over the contents here. The development of mankind goes back hundreds of thousands of years, but here in China it is only today that conditions have been secured for the planned development of our economy and culture. Given these conditions, the face of our country will change from year to year. The change in each five years will be considerable and after several five-year periods very much bigger.

(Note to "The Long-Range Plan of the Red Star Collective Farm")

30

This is a good article. Everyone ought to read it and co-operatives in all localities can consult it when they draw up their own long-term plans. As the author puts it so aptly, "The whole process of drawing up a production plan is one of struggle between advanced and conservative thinking." Conservative ideas are causing trouble almost everywhere. To overcome them and take the productive forces and production a big step forward, all localities and co-operatives should draw up their own long-range plans.

(Note to "The Three-Year Production Plan of a Co-operative")

31

This township has made a two-year plan for co-operative transformation, increased production, water conservancy, consolidation

of the Party and Youth League organizations, cultural and educational work, etc., and so should every township in China. Some people say plans are hard to make, then how did this township manage it? In 1956 every county, district and township in our country should draw up a comprehensive plan, which should include more items than the above plan, items such as side-line production, trade, finance, afforestation and health work. Even if the plan is a bit crude and not quite in accord with actual conditions, it is better than none. If one or two counties, districts and townships in a province can produce fairly good plans, these can be immediately publicized and serve as models for other counties, districts and townships. Planning is said to be hard, but actually it's not so hard.

(Note to "Yitao Township's Comprehensive Plan")

32

This article is very useful and can serve as reference material for all counties. In its over-all planning every county should map out an appropriate plan for water conservancy. Water conservancy is an important measure to ensure increased agricultural production, small projects are well within the capacity of every county, district, township and co-operative, and it is therefore most necessary for plans to be drawn up and carried out in stages over a number of years to ensure irrigation in times of drought and drainage in times of water-logging, barring extraordinary and uncontrollable floods and droughts. This is certainly practicable. Organized in co-operatives, the masses have immense strength. Insoluble for thousands of years, the problems of ordinary floods and droughts can now be solved in a matter of a few years.

(Note to "Let Everyone Have One *Mou* of Irrigated Land")

33

Pig-raising is an important matter which has a direct bearing on the provision of fertilizer, meat supply and the earning of foreign

exchange from exports; therefore all co-operatives should include the raising of pigs in their plans, and naturally the provinces, prefectures, counties and districts should all have their own plans. Pig-feed is readily available; some kinds of grass and tree leaves, sweet potatoes and their vines are all pig-feed, and it need not necessarily be grain, still less a lot of it. Apart from collective pig-raising by co-operatives, every peasant household should be advised to raise one or more pigs, and this goal is to be attained by stages in a few years. Of course exceptions should be made in the case of some minority nationality communities where pig-raising is taboo and of some families which object to raising pigs on religious grounds. A set of measures should be devised to reward pig-raising and the experience of the Shanghai Co-operative in Chekiang Province can serve for the reference of all localities.

(Note to "Plenty of Pigs Are Raised Here")

34

Before the co-operative transformation of agriculture, surplus labour-power was a problem in many parts of the country. Since then many co-operatives have felt the pinch of a labour shortage and the need to mobilize the masses of women, who did not work in the fields before, to take their place on the labour front. This was a major development that came as a surprise to many people. People had generally expected a surplus of labour-power in the wake of co-operation. A surplus already, and what if there should be another one? In many places co-operation in practice has dispelled such misgivings, as the problem has not been a surplus but a shortage of labour-power. Some places did find a surplus of labour-power for a while following co-operation, but that was because they had not yet extended the scale of production, initiated diverse economic undertakings or started intensive cultivation. For many places the labour shortage becomes evident as production grows in scale, the number of undertakings increases, the efforts to remake nature become more extensive and intensive and the work is done more thoroughly. This is only the beginning, and it will become more evident as the years go by. It will be the same after agriculture is mechanized. In the days to come all kinds of enterprises undreamed of before will make their appearance

and agricultural output will rise several times, a dozen times, perhaps scores of times, above the present level. The expansion of industry, communications and exchange will defy the imagination of past generations. It will be the same with science, culture, education and health work. Women form a great reserve of labour-power in China. This reserve should be tapped in the struggle to build a great socialist country. The principle of equal pay for equal work for men and women must be enforced to encourage women to engage in productive activity. All co-operatives can draw upon the experience of Chienteh County in Chekiang Province.

(Note to "Labour Shortage Solved by Rallying Women to Join in Production")

35

This is also a common problem. The experience of these two co-operatives shows that under present conditions of production there is already a surplus of roughly one-third of the labour-power. What required three people in the past can be done by two after co-operative transformation, an indication of the superiority of socialism. Where can an outlet be found for this surplus labour-power of one-third or more? For the most part, still in the countryside. Socialism has not only liberated the working people and freed the means of production from the shackles of the old society but has also released the boundless resources of nature which the old society could not exploit. The masses have unlimited creative power. They can organize themselves to take on all spheres and branches of work where they can give full play to their energy, tackle production more intensively and extensively and initiate more and more undertakings for their own well-being. So far we have not touched on the mechanization of agriculture. With mechanization, much more labour-power can be saved. Will there be an outlet? Yes, there will be one, too, according to the experience of certain mechanized state farms. As the scope of production expands, the number of undertakings increases and the work is done more intensively, there is no need to worry about labour-power not being put to use.

(Note to "An Outlet Has Been Found for Surplus Labour-Power")

36

Things in this county also show us that an outlet can be found in the villages for rural surplus labour-power. As management improves and the scope of production expands, every able-bodied man and woman can put in more work-days in the year. Instead of over one hundred work-days for a man and a few score for a woman as described in this article, the former can put in well over two hundred work-days and the latter well over one hundred or more. Some co-operatives in other parts of the country have already reached that level. Side-line production must have an assured market and not develop blindly — this is correct. Taking the country as a whole, rural side-line production in a large measure caters to the countryside, but a fair part, which is likely to expand in the future, must cater to the cities and meet export requirements. The point is that the state must have a unified plan so as gradually to eliminate blind development.

(Note to “Hsiangyin County Has Found an Outlet for Surplus Labour-Power”)

37

This article is very good and what it describes should be the example for all localities. “Bookkeepers are not available” — this is one of the excuses of those who are against the rapid development of co-operation. Agricultural co-operation throughout the country calls for several million bookkeepers, and where are they to be found? As a matter of fact such manpower is available, since large numbers of primary school and junior middle school graduates can be mobilized to do the job. What is required is to train them quickly and raise their literacy level and vocational ability in the course of their work. In each district organize the bookkeepers from the producers’, the supply and marketing and the credit co-operatives into a bookkeepers’ mutual-aid network — this would be a good way to raise their literacy and vocational levels. Such a network in Changwu County’s Third District has helped raise the bookkeepers’ level in both these respects and has done a lot of economic and political work besides. Party organizations

at the county and district levels must give their attention and guidance to the work discussed here.

(Note to "Experience in Organizing Bookkeepers for the Agricultural Producers", the Supply and Marketing and the Credit Co-operatives into a Bookkeepers' Mutual-Aid Network")

38

The experience discussed here should be popularized. Lenin said that "a communist society cannot be built in an illiterate country".⁴ In our country today there are so many illiterates, and yet the building of socialism cannot wait until illiteracy is eliminated; thus an acute contradiction arises. In our country today, it is not only the many school-age children who have no schools to go to, but also large numbers of young people above that age, to say nothing of adults. This serious problem must be, and can only be, solved in the course of agricultural co-operation. With the formation of co-operatives, the peasants have a strong urge to learn to read and write out of economic necessity. With the formation of co-operatives, the peasants have collective strength, the situation changes completely and they can organize their own literacy classes. First, to be able to record work-points, they must learn to write the names of the persons and places in their village or township, the names of farm implements, the terms for different kinds of farm work and other indispensable words — two or three hundred in all. Next, they must acquire a bigger vocabulary. Two kinds of textbooks are thus needed. The first should be compiled with the needs of the co-operatives in a particular locality in mind by the local educated people with the help of the comrades guiding the work of co-operation. Each locality should compile a textbook of its own, and there should not be a uniform text for all. This textbook does not need approval by the higher authorities. The second textbook, also with a vocabulary of a few hundred words and to be compiled in the same manner, should be based on things and expressions pertinent to a relatively limited area (for instance, a county or prefecture), and in addition on certain things and expressions of the province (or municipality or autonomous region) and the whole country. This kind of textbook need not be uniform in all localities either, but it should be examined

promptly by the educational authorities of the county, prefecture, or province (or municipality or autonomous region). After these two steps, a third should be taken; this will require the educational authorities of each province (or municipality or autonomous region) to prepare a third textbook for general use. More advanced textbooks will subsequently have to be compiled. The cultural and educational authorities at the national level should give proper guidance in this matter. The Youth League branch of Kaochialiukou Village, Chunan County, Shantung Province, has done something creative. It is most gratifying to see how things are going there. They found teachers among the graduates of their township primary school. Progress was rapid with more than a hundred young people and adults learning over two hundred words in two and a half months. They can now keep records of their own work-points and some have become work-point recorders for the co-operative. "A course for recording work-points" — that's an apt name, too. Such courses should be opened everywhere. Youth League organizations at every level should give guidance to this work and all Party and government organizations should give it their support.

(Note to "The Experience of the Youth League Branch of Kaochialiukou Village, Chunan County, in Starting a Course for Recording Work-Points")

39

This is about the Gold Star Agricultural, Forestry and Livestock Producers' Co-operative led by Li Shun-ta. In the three years since its formation it has grown into a large co-operative with 283 households. It is located in a barren area in the Taihang Mountains, but by sheer hard work on the part of all during these three years it has begun to take on a new look. The utilization rate of labour-power is now 110.6 per cent higher than in the days of individual farming before the anti-Japanese war and 74 per cent higher than in the period of the mutual-aid teams before the co-operative was formed. The co-operative's accumulation has increased from 120 yuan in its first year to over 11,000 yuan. In 1955 each member received an average of 884 catties of grain, which is 77 per cent more than in the days before the anti-Japanese war and

25.1 per cent more than in the mutual-aid team period. This co-operative made a five-year plan, but after three years its total output value is already 100.6 per cent of the target set by the plan. The experience of this co-operative poses the following question to us: If large increases in output can be attained in places where the natural conditions are poor, why can't places where the natural conditions are more favourable do even better?

(Note to "Run the Co-operative with Diligence and Thrift, Develop the Mountain Areas")

40

This is a well managed co-operative. One can learn a great deal from its valuable experience. Chufu County is Confucius' home town where the old man ran a school for many years and trained a good number of capable disciples, a fact that is quite well known. But he didn't care much about the economic aspects of the life of the people. When his disciple Fan Chih asked him how to do farming, he not only parried the question but abused Fan Chih behind his back as belonging to "the lower orders".⁵ Now the people in his home town have set up socialist co-operatives. After three years of co-operation, the economic and cultural life of the people, who were poor and destitute for over two thousand years, has begun to change. This demonstrates that the socialism of our time has indeed no parallel in history. Socialism is infinitely superior to the Confucian "classics". I would like to suggest to those interested in visiting the Temple and Tomb of Confucius that on their way they might well go and have a look at the co-operative described here.

(Note to "An Agricultural Producers' Co-operative Increases Production by 67 Per Cent in Three Years")

41

This article is very well written and worth reading. Most of the existing semi-socialist co-operatives are small, each with only twenty

or thirty households, because co-operatives of that size are easy to set up and give the cadres and members an opportunity to gain experience quickly. But with its few members, little land and scanty funds a small co-operative cannot operate on a large scale or use machinery. Co-operatives so small in size still hamper the development of the productive forces; they should not remain at this stage for long, but should gradually merge. In some places a single co-operative may embrace an entire township, in a few places several townships, but, of course, in many others one township may have several co-operatives. Big co-operatives can be formed in mountain areas as well as on the plains. The township in Anhwei Province where the Futzuling Reservoir is situated is all hills for dozens of *li* around. It is precisely here that a big co-operative has been set up which goes in for agriculture, forestry and livestock in a comprehensive way. Of course the amalgamation of co-operatives should proceed step by step with the members' consent and when suitable cadres are available.

(Note to "The Superiority of the Big Co-operative")

42

The experience of the Red Flag Co-operative on Hainan Island has again demonstrated the greater advantages of big co-operatives and co-operatives of the advanced type. Only one year after its formation, this big co-operative was ready to move on to the advanced stage. Of course, this is not to say that all co-operatives should follow suit, for they must first consider whether their conditions are ripe before deciding when to merge and move on to the advanced stage. But generally speaking, a period of three years is about right. The important thing is to set examples for the peasants. When they see that big co-operatives and co-operatives of the advanced type yield greater advantages than small and elementary ones, they will want to merge their co-operatives and move on to the advanced stage.

(Note to "The Red Flag Agricultural Producers' Co-operative in the First District of Chiungshan County Grows Strong in the Struggle Against Natural Disasters and Capitalist Ideology")

It is necessary to consider changing elementary co-operatives to advanced ones when their conditions are ripe, so as to further develop their productive forces and production. Since elementary co-operatives maintain a system of semi-private ownership,⁶ with the passage of time this will hamper the development of the productive forces and people will begin to demand a change in the system of ownership, so that the co-operative will become a collectively managed economic unit in which the means of production are owned wholly in common. Once the productive forces are further freed, production will expand even more. Some places can make the change-over fairly quickly, others will probably have to go a bit more slowly. After functioning for about three years co-operatives of an elementary type will in the main acquire the necessary conditions. The Party organizations in every province, municipality and autonomous region should look into this matter and make preparations, and during 1956 and 1957 establish a number of experimental co-operatives of the advanced type with the consent of the masses. In general, the co-operatives today are small, and when they switch over to the advanced type, the many small co-operatives should be merged into big ones with the consent of the masses. If in 1956 and 1957 every district can get one or more such co-operatives organized and their superiority over the elementary type is made plain to the masses, this will create favourable conditions for co-operatives to merge and move on to the advanced stage in the years to follow. This work must be co-ordinated with over-all planning to expand production. When people see that big co-operatives and co-operatives of the advanced type have greater advantages than small and elementary ones, when people see that long-range planning brings a much higher level of material and cultural life in its train, they will agree to merge their co-operatives and move on to the advanced stage. The elevation to the advanced stage will proceed more quickly in the suburban areas. The experience of this co-operative in Peking can serve as reference material for other co-operatives with similar conditions.

(Note to "A Co-operative That Goes from the Elementary to the Advanced Type")

NOTES

¹ In its early days the Wang Kuo-fan Co-operative was woefully short of means of production. Instead of asking for state loans, the co-operative 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.

² Here "reverse propaganda" means making clear to the masses the difficulties and adversities they may come across in forming co-operatives, in addition to publicizing the advantages and favourable conditions. This was done when the masses were fully aroused and applied in great numbers for co-operative membership, so that they could weigh the matter thoroughly and join of their own free will.

³ The four comparisons were to compare and see which was better: (1) the co-operative, the mutual-aid team, or peasants working on their own; (2) socialism or capitalism; (3) a system with exploitation or a system without exploitation, and (4) personal enrichment or prosperity for all. The five calculations referred to the calculations of the superiority of the co-operatives with respect to (1) coping with natural disasters, (2) increasing earnings through the promotion of side-lines, (3) increasing work-points by arousing enthusiasm for labour, (4) increasing production as a result of mutually beneficial co-operation by the poor and the middle peasants, and (5) overcoming difficulties in production and in livelihood.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues".

⁵ *Confucian Analects*, Book XIII, "Tzu Lu".

⁶ The elementary co-operative characterized by the pooling of land as shares and unified management was semi-socialist in nature. It maintained private ownership by the co-operative members of such means of production as land, draught animals and the larger farm implements, and the co-operative had to pay "dividends" to its members for their use. The elementary co-operative was therefore said to have retained semi-private ownership.

REQUEST FOR OPINIONS ON THE SEVENTEEN-ARTICLE DOCUMENT CONCERNING AGRICULTURE

December 21, 1955

In November this year a seventeen-article document was agreed upon after consultations held by Comrade Mao Tsetung in Hangchow and Tientsin with secretaries of the Party committees of fourteen provinces and the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. The Central Committee holds that the document should be confirmed at the conference of secretaries of the provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees to be convened by the Central Committee on January 10 so that it can be incorporated in the 1956 plan and begin to be carried out in earnest. To this end, on receiving this message please summon the secretaries of all the prefectural Party committees and of some of the county Party committees under your jurisdiction to make a detailed study of the following questions:

- (1) Whether all or only some of the articles can be carried out and whether the conditions are sufficient for carrying out each article;
- (2) Whether any additions to the seventeen articles are needed (additions which are practicable can be made); and
- (3) Whether you are ready to incorporate the seventeen articles in your 1956 plan and carry them out right away.

Please complete your study of these questions and have your opinions ready by January 3, 1956.

The seventeen articles are as follows:

Circular drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and sent to the Shanghai Bureau and the provincial and autonomous region Party committees.

1. Regarding the pace of the co-operative transformation of agriculture, the work of establishing co-operatives of the elementary type should in the main be accomplished by the latter half of 1956, and it is advisable for the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions (Sinkiang excepted) to set a target for co-operative membership of 75 per cent of the peasant households and let the lower levels exceed this somewhat and reach about 80 to 85 per cent.

As for co-operation of the higher stage, you should strive to accomplish it basically by 1960, or if possible a year sooner, by 1959. To this end it is necessary for the counties, and preferably the districts, to take direct charge of setting up one or more large co-operatives of the advanced type (each with over a hundred households) in every county or district in 1956 and then another batch in 1957 — these two batches should account for about 25 per cent of the peasant households and serve as models. Is this possible or not? What should be the size of a co-operative when small co-operatives merge into big ones? Several co-operatives forming one township, one co-operative forming one township, or one co-operative embracing several townships — are all three forms practicable? Which is the more suitable figure for the total number of co-operatives in the country — 300,000, 400,000, or 500,000? The figure is 100,000 in the Soviet Union; would over 300,000, or 400,000, be more suitable for us? Further, which way is better — to merge the co-operatives first and then raise them to the higher stage, or to merge and raise them at the same time, or to raise them first and then merge them? Please consider these questions as well.

2. As for the admission of landlords and rich peasants into co-operatives, perhaps during 1956 you could act upon the suggestion made by Anhwei, Shansi and Heilungkiang Provinces, that is, allowing those who behave well to join and those who behave neither well nor badly to take part in co-operative production but without co-operative membership, while compelling those who behave badly to engage in production under the co-operatives' supervision. This method can be adopted by all the old co-operatives which have strong cadres. There are many advantages to this, though there is one disadvantage, namely, those upper-middle peasants who are as yet unwilling to join the co-operatives will inevitably feel obliged to do so, and moreover they will have to be admitted before the landlords and rich peasants so as to save their face. Is this good or not? Or shall we postpone the adoption of the above method for a year, that is, until 1957? Please consider which alternative is better.

3. As for the composition of the leadership in a co-operative, two-thirds should come from among the present-day poor peasants plus all the new lower-middle peasants who were formerly poor peasants, while one-third should come from among the old lower-middle peasants and the old and new upper-middle peasants.

4. Conditions for increasing production: (a) carry out a few fundamental measures (the details still have to be discussed, and some differences may be allowed for different places); (b) spread advanced experience (materials on models are to be collected every year and published in a volume by each province).

5. In 1956 every province, prefecture, county, district and township should draw up a long-term comprehensive plan embracing all the necessary items, with stress on county and township plans. A draft should be prepared in the first half of the year and finalized in the second, subject to further revision. The plan should cover a period of at least three years, preferably seven, possibly as many as twelve. This must be done without delay. Have you made any arrangements for it? While many plans are likely to be rough-and-ready for lack of experience, you should strive to have a few counties and townships draw up more realistic plans so that they can be recommended as models.

6. Make an over-all plan for the protection and breeding of cattle, horses, mules, donkeys, pigs, sheep, chickens and ducks, and especially for the protection of young animals. The breeding plans will be discussed, so please have your opinions ready.

7. In co-ordination with the plans for river basins, there should be widespread construction of small water conservancy projects to ensure basic control over ordinary floods and droughts within seven years.

8. Within seven years, basically eliminate a dozen or so insect pests and plant diseases harmful to crops.

9. Within twelve years, make most of the waste land and barren hills productive and achieve afforestation by planting trees according to specified requirements in every possible place, that is, around every house and every village, by roadsides and watersides as well as on waste land and barren hills.

10. Within twelve years, in most regions 90 per cent, and in some regions 100 per cent, of the needed fertilizer is to be supplied by the localities and co-operatives themselves.

11. Within twelve years, the average yield of grain per *mou* should reach four hundred catties in the areas north of the Yellow River, the

Chinling Mountains, the Pailung River and the section of the Yellow River inside Chinghai Province, five hundred catties in the areas south of the Yellow River and north of the Huai River, and eight hundred catties in the areas south of the Huai River, the Chinling Mountains and the Pailung River. As for cotton, oil-bearing crops, soya beans, silk, tea, jute, sugar-cane, fruit and other items, please suggest a quota for each item for discussion.

12. Within seven years, basically eliminate a number of those diseases most harmful to human beings and livestock, such as schistosomiasis, filariasis, bubonic plague, encephalitis, cattle plague and hog cholera. Please study which of the endemic diseases in your province or region can be basically wiped out within seven years, which will take longer, and which cannot be wiped out under present conditions.

13. Get rid of the four pests, that is, within seven years basically exterminate rats (and other harmful animals), sparrows (and other birds which damage crops, but whether it is advisable to exterminate crows remains to be investigated), flies and mosquitoes.¹

14. Within seven years, basically wipe out illiteracy, setting a literacy target of 1,500 to 2,000 characters.

15. Within seven years, build according to specified requirements the different kinds of roads (highways, roads and paths) needed in the provinces, prefectures, counties, districts and townships.

16. Within seven years, install wired broadcasting networks so that broadcasts can reach every township and every co-operative.

17. Within seven years, complete the installation of telephone networks connecting townships and large co-operatives.

Please consider the above points with other comrades concerned and complete preparations by January 3. The Central Committee may first summon the secretaries of some provincial Party committees to a meeting around January 4 to study these matters for several days and to have suggestions ready for the coming conference on January 10.

NOTES

¹ The directive on health work drafted in March 1960 by Comrade Mao Tsetung for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party says, "There is another thing. Stop killing sparrows; instead, wipe out bedbugs. The slogan should be, 'Exterminate rats, bedbugs, flies and mosquitoes.'"

SPEED UP THE SOCIALIST TRANSFORMATION OF HANDICRAFTS

March 5, 1956

1. It seems to me that the pace of the socialist transformation of independent handicrafts was a little too slow. I said so in January this year at the conference of secretaries of provincial and municipal Party committees. By the end of 1955 only two million handicraftsmen had been organized. In the first two months of this year, however, three million more have been organized, so in the main the work can be accomplished this year; that is fine. You are contemplating an average annual increase of 10.9 per cent in the total value of handicraft production over a period of three five-year plans; that seems a bit too small. We set too low a target in the First Five-Year Plan and have suffered a little in consequence; it need not be changed now, but you should use your discretion.

2. As for the size of handicraft co-operatives, generally speaking, about one hundred people per co-operative would be appropriate, although some may have several hundred and others only a few dozen.

3. It is a good idea to organize co-operatives of the blacksmiths and carpenters who make the rounds of the villages to repair farm implements and serve agricultural production; the peasants will certainly welcome this. That is what handicraftsmen in China have been doing for thousands of years. Organized in co-operatives, the craftsmen can improve their skills and serve the peasants better.

4. You have said that the masses were dissatisfied because production was centralized in the repair and service trades and too many service stations were closed during the high tide of the transformation

Part of Comrade Mao Tsetung's instructions when the departments concerned under the State Council reported their work on handicrafts.

of handicrafts. That was too bad! What is to be done now? “The general trend under heaven is that there is bound to be unification after prolonged division and division after prolonged unification.”

5. The highest labour productivity in mechanized and semi-mechanized production is over thirty times the lowest in handicraft production. The annual value of output per capita is 20,000 to 30,000 yuan in modernized state industry, 5,000 yuan in mechanized and semi-mechanized co-operatives, 2,000 yuan in big co-operatives with more than 100 handicraftsmen, 1,500 yuan in small co-operatives and 800 to 900 yuan among independent handicraftsmen. Compare the differences in labour productivity and it becomes clear that the handicrafts must develop in the direction of semi-mechanization and mechanization and that labour productivity must be raised.

6. All the handicraft trades perform useful services. They provide food, clothing and other things for daily use. They also produce arts and crafts, such as cloisonne or the glass grapes blown by “the five spinsters of the Chang family”.¹ Besides, the technique of roasting Peking duck is exportable. People in some service trades make their rounds of the streets and villages, fixing all sorts of things, as in the play *Mending Jars for Auntie Wang* — these people travel around and are well-informed. The Dawn-in-the-East Market in Peking displays more than six thousand kinds of articles for sale.

Mind you, don't let our fine handicraft products be discarded. Pock-marked Wang's and Chang Hsiao-chuan's kitchen knives and scissors must not be discarded, no, not even ten thousand years from now. Anything good and characteristically Chinese that has been discarded must be restored and even improved.

7. It is a good idea to improve the quality of arts and crafts and to look after the old master craftsmen, and you should start now and speed up the work. You can set up organizations, open schools and call meetings. Yang Shih-hui, the ivory carver, is actually a very fine artist. Once he and I ate at table together, and while observing me he was able to carve my likeness. I could have observed him for several days without being able to draw a picture of him, I'm afraid.

8. The prices of equipment and materials allocated by the state to the co-operatives should be reasonably fixed and must not be set at the normal allocation prices. Co-operatives are not the same as state enterprises and there is a difference between socialist collective ownership and socialist ownership by the whole people. At the outset the economic foundations of the co-operatives are not strong enough and

they need state assistance. It is a good idea for the state to allocate to the co-operatives at low prices old machines which have been replaced as well as the machinery and factory buildings rendered surplus by the amalgamation of privately owned plants under joint state-private management. "Give in order to take." When the foundations of the co-operatives have become strong enough, the state will collect a larger tax from them and raise the prices of raw materials too. By that time, the co-operatives will be owned by the collective in form but in reality by the whole people.

The state should help the co-operatives to achieve semi-mechanization and mechanization, and they themselves should strive for the same goal. The greater the speed of mechanization, the shorter the life of your handicraft co-operatives. The more your "kingdom" shrinks, the better it is for our common cause. You should exert yourselves to hasten mechanization and make a greater contribution to the state.

9. Since the value of handicraft output forms a quarter of the total value of the country's industrial output, why is it that the supply of raw materials for the handicrafts as well as their production and sales have not been made part of the state plan? The handicrafts assume such large proportions that they should be included in the state plan.

10. In some places the Party committees are so occupied with other tasks that they don't put handicrafts on the agenda; this is not good. Why are some cadres rather unwilling to undertake this work? I myself would very much like to do it, as it is very important.

11. You should select outstanding examples from among the sixty-thousand-odd handicraft co-operatives and compile material on their typical experience. The examples should be chosen from every locality and every trade and should include good and bad, big and small, concentrated and scattered, as well as semi-mechanized and mechanized co-operatives. They should be published in book form like *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*.

NOTES

¹ This refers to the five women of Master Chang's family in Peking famous for the glass grapes they blew.

ON THE TEN MAJOR RELATIONSHIPS

April 25, 1956

In recent months the Political Bureau of the Central Committee has heard reports on the work of thirty-four industrial, agricultural, transport, commercial, financial and other departments under the central authorities and from these reports has identified a number of problems concerning socialist construction and socialist transformation. In all, they boil down to ten problems, or ten major relationships.

It is to focus on one basic policy that these ten problems are being raised, the basic policy of mobilizing all positive factors, internal and external, to serve the cause of socialism. In the past we followed this policy of mobilizing all positive factors in order to put an end to the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism and to win victory for the people's democratic revolution. We are now following the same policy in order to carry on the socialist revolution and build a socialist country. Nevertheless, there are some problems in our work that need discussion. Particularly worthy of attention is the fact that in the Soviet Union certain defects and errors that occurred in the course of their building socialism have lately come to light. Do you want to follow the detours they have made? It was by drawing lessons from their experience that we were able to avoid certain detours in the past, and there is all the more reason for us to do so now.

What are the positive factors, internal and external? Internally, the workers and the peasants are the basic force. The middle forces are forces that can be won over. The reactionary forces are a negative factor, but even so we should do our work well and turn this negative

Speech at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. Bearing in mind lessons drawn from the Soviet Union, Comrade Mao Tsetung summed up China's experience, dealt with ten major relationships in socialist revolution and socialist construction and set forth the ideas underlying the general line of building socialism with greater, faster, better and more economical results, a line suited to the conditions of our country.

factor as far as possible into a positive one. Internationally, all the forces that can be united with must be united, the forces that are not neutral can be neutralized through our efforts, and even the reactionary forces can be split and made use of. In short, we should mobilize all forces, whether direct or indirect, and strive to make China a powerful socialist country.

I will now discuss the ten problems.

I. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HEAVY INDUSTRY ON THE ONE HAND AND LIGHT INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE ON THE OTHER

The emphasis in our country's construction is on heavy industry. The production of the means of production must be given priority, that's settled. But it definitely does not follow that the production of the means of subsistence, especially grain, can be neglected. Without enough food and other daily necessities, it would be impossible to provide for the workers in the first place, and then what sense would it make to talk about developing heavy industry? Therefore, the relationship between heavy industry on the one hand and light industry and agriculture on the other must be properly handled.

In dealing with this relationship we have not made mistakes of principle. We have done better than the Soviet Union and a number of East European countries. The prolonged failure of the Soviet Union to reach the highest pre-October Revolution level in grain output, the grave problems arising from the glaring disequilibrium between the development of heavy industry and that of light industry in some East European countries — such problems do not exist in our country. Their lop-sided stress on heavy industry to the neglect of agriculture and light industry results in a shortage of goods on the market and an unstable currency. We, on the other hand, attach more importance to agriculture and light industry. We have all along attended to and developed agriculture and have to a considerable degree ensured the supply of grain and raw materials necessary for the development of industry. Our daily necessities are in fairly good supply and our prices and currency are stable.

The problem now facing us is that of continuing to adjust properly the ratio between investment in heavy industry on the one hand and

in agriculture and light industry on the other in order to bring about a greater development of the latter. Does this mean that heavy industry is no longer primary? No. It still is, it still claims the emphasis in our investment. But the proportion for agriculture and light industry must be somewhat increased.

What will be the results of this increase? First, the daily needs of the people will be better satisfied, and, second, the accumulation of capital will be speeded up so that we can develop heavy industry with greater and better results. Heavy industry can also accumulate capital, but, given our present economic conditions, light industry and agriculture can accumulate more and faster.

Here the question arises: Is your desire to develop heavy industry genuine or feigned, strong or weak? If your desire is feigned or weak, then you will hit agriculture and light industry and invest less in them. If your desire is genuine or strong, then you will attach importance to agriculture and light industry so that there will be more grain and more raw materials for light industry and a greater accumulation of capital. And there will be more funds in the future to invest in heavy industry.

There are now two possible approaches to our development of heavy industry: one is to develop agriculture and light industry less, and the other is to develop them more. In the long run, the first approach will lead to a smaller and slower development of heavy industry, or at least will put it on a less solid foundation, and when the over-all account is added up a few decades hence, it will not prove to have paid. The second approach will lead to a greater and faster development of heavy industry and, since it ensures the livelihood of the people, it will lay a more solid foundation for the development of heavy industry.

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDUSTRY IN THE COASTAL REGIONS AND INDUSTRY IN THE INTERIOR

In the past our industry was concentrated in the coastal regions. By coastal regions we mean Liaoning, Hopei, Peking, Tientsin, eastern Honan, Shantung, Anhwei, Kiangsu, Shanghai, Chekiang, Fukien, Kwangtung and Kwangsi. About 70 per cent of all our industry, both light and heavy, is to be found in the coastal regions and only 30 per

cent in the interior. This irrational situation is a product of history. The coastal industrial base must be put to full use, but to even out the distribution of industry as it develops we must strive to promote industry in the interior. We have not made any major mistakes on the relationship between the two. However, in recent years we have underestimated coastal industry to some extent and have not given great enough attention to its development. This must change.

Not so long ago, there was still fighting in Korea and the international situation was quite tense; this could not but affect our attitude towards coastal industry. Now, it seems unlikely that there will be a new war of aggression against China or another world war in the near future, and there will probably be a period of peace for a decade or more. It would therefore be wrong if we still fail to make full use of the plant capacity and technical forces of coastal industry. If we are to have only five years, not to say ten, we should still work hard to develop industries in the coastal regions for four years and evacuate them when war breaks out in the fifth. According to available information, in light industry the construction of a plant and its accumulation of capital generally proceed quite rapidly. After the whole plant goes into production, it can earn enough in four years to build three new factories, or two, or one or at least half of one, in addition to recouping its capital outlay. Why shouldn't we do such profitable things? The notion that the atom bomb is already overhead and about to fall on us in a matter of seconds is a calculation at variance with reality, and it would be wrong to take a negative attitude towards coastal industry on this account.

It does not follow that all new factories should be built in the coastal regions. Without doubt, the greater part of the new industry should be located in the interior so that industry may gradually become evenly distributed; moreover, this will help our preparations against war. But a number of new factories and mines, even some large ones, may also be built in the coastal regions. As for the expansion and reconstruction of the light and heavy industries already in the coastal regions, we have done a fair amount of work in the past and will do much more in the future.

Making good use of the old industries in the coastal regions and developing their capacities will put us in a stronger position to promote and support industry in the interior. To adopt a negative attitude would be to hinder the latter's speedy growth. So it is likewise a question of whether the desire to develop industry in the interior is

genuine or not. If it is genuine and not feigned, we must more actively use and promote industry in the coastal regions, especially light industry.

III. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ECONOMIC CONSTRUCTION AND DEFENCE CONSTRUCTION

National defence is indispensable. Our defence capabilities have attained a certain level. As a result of the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea and of several years of training and consolidation, our armed forces have grown more powerful and are now stronger than was the Soviet Red Army before the Second World War; also, there have been improvements in armaments. Our defence industry is being built up. Ever since Pan Ku separated heaven and earth, we have never been able to make planes and cars, and now we are beginning to make them.

We do not have the atom bomb yet. But neither did we have planes and artillery in the past. We defeated the Japanese imperialists and Chiang Kai-shek with millet plus rifles. We are stronger than before and will be stronger still in the future. We will have not only more planes and artillery but atom bombs too. If we are not to be bullied in the present-day world, we cannot do without the bomb. Then what is to be done about it? One reliable way is to cut military and administrative expenditures down to appropriate proportions and increase expenditures on economic construction. Only with the faster growth of economic construction can there be greater progress in defence construction.

At the Third Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of our Party in 1950, we already raised the question of streamlining the state apparatus and reducing military and administrative expenditures and considered this measure to be one of the three prerequisites for achieving a fundamental turn for the better in our financial and economic situation. In the period of the First Five-Year Plan, military and administrative expenditures accounted for 30 per cent of the total expenditures in the state budget. This proportion is much too high. In the period of the Second Five-Year Plan, we must reduce it to around 20 per cent, so that more funds can be released for building more factories and turning out more machines. After a time, we shall not only have plenty of planes and artillery but probably have our own atom bombs as well.

Here again the question arises: Is your desire for the atom bomb genuine and very keen? Or is it only lukewarm and not so very keen? If your desire is genuine and very keen, then you will reduce the proportion of military and administrative expenditures and spend more on economic construction. If your desire is not genuine or not so very keen, you will stay in the old rut. This is a matter of strategic policy, and I hope the Military Commission will discuss it.

Would it be all right to demobilize all our troops now? No, it would not. For enemies are still around, and we are being bullied and encircled by them. We must strengthen our national defence, and for that purpose we must first of all strengthen our work in economic construction.

IV. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STATE, THE UNITS OF PRODUCTION AND THE PRODUCERS

The relationship between the state on the one hand and factories and agricultural co-operatives on the other and the relationship between factories and agricultural co-operatives on the one hand and the producers on the other should both be handled well. To this end we should consider not just one side but all three, the state, the collective and the individual, or, as we used to say, "take into consideration both the army and the people" and "take into consideration both the public and the private interest". In view of the experience of the Soviet Union as well as our own, we must see to it that from now on this problem is solved much better.

Take the workers for example. As their labour productivity rises, there should be a gradual improvement in their working conditions and collective welfare. We have always advocated plain living and hard work and opposed putting personal material benefits above everything else; at the same time we have always advocated concern for the livelihood of the masses and opposed bureaucracy, which is callous to their well-being. With the growth of our economy as a whole, wages should be appropriately adjusted. We have recently decided to increase wages to some extent, mainly the wages of those at the lower levels, the wages of the workers, in order to narrow the wage gap between them and the upper levels. Generally speaking, our wages are not high, but compared with the past the life of our workers has greatly

improved because, among other things, more people are employed and prices remain low and stable. Under the regime of the proletariat, our workers have unfailingly displayed high political consciousness and enthusiasm for labour. When at the end of last year the Central Committee called for a fight against Right conservatism, the masses of workers warmly responded and, what was exceptional, overfulfilled the plan for the first quarter of the year by working all out for three months. We must strive to encourage this zeal for hard work and at the same time pay still greater attention to solving the pressing problems in their work and everyday life.

Here I would like to touch on the question of the independence of the factories under unified leadership. It's not right, I'm afraid, to place everything in the hands of the central or the provincial and municipal authorities without leaving the factories any power of their own, any room for independent action, any benefits. We don't have much experience on how to share power and returns properly among the central authorities, the provincial and municipal authorities and the factories, and we should study the subject. As a matter of principle, centralization and independence form a unity of opposites, and there must be both centralization and independence. For instance, we are now having a meeting, which is centralization; after the meeting, some of us will go for a walk, some will read books, some will go to eat, which is independence. If we don't adjourn the meeting and give everyone some independence but let it go on and on, wouldn't it be the death of us all? This is true of individuals, and no less true of factories and other units of production. Every unit of production must enjoy independence as the correlative of centralization if it is to develop more vigorously.

Now about the peasants. Our relations with the peasants have always been good, but we did make a mistake on the question of grain. In 1954 floods caused a decrease in production in some parts of our country, and yet we purchased 7,000 million more cattles of grain. A decrease in production and an increase in purchasing — this made grain the topic on almost everyone's lips in many places last spring, and nearly every household talked about the state monopoly for marketing grain. The peasants were disgruntled, and there were a lot of complaints both inside and outside the Party. Although quite a few people indulged in deliberate exaggeration and exploited the opportunity to attack us, it cannot be said that we had no shortcomings. Inadequate investigation and failure to size up the situation resulted

in the purchase of 7,000 million cattles more; that was a shortcoming. After discovering it, we purchased 7,000 million cattles less in 1955 and introduced a system of fixed quotas for grain production, purchasing and marketing¹ and, what's more, there was a good harvest. With a decrease in purchasing and an increase in production, the peasants had over 20,000 million more cattles of grain at their disposal. Thus even those peasants who had complaints before said, "The Communist Party is really good." This lesson the whole Party must bear in mind.

The Soviet Union has adopted measures which squeeze the peasants very hard. It takes away too much from the peasants at too low a price through its system of so-called obligatory sales² and other measures. This method of capital accumulation has seriously dampened the peasants' enthusiasm for production. You want the hen to lay more eggs and yet you don't feed it, you want the horse to run fast and yet you don't let it graze. What kind of logic is that!

Our policies towards the peasants differ from those of the Soviet Union and take into account the interests of both the state and the peasants. Our agricultural tax has always been relatively low. In the exchange of industrial and agricultural products we follow a policy of narrowing the price scissors, a policy of exchanging equal or roughly equal values. The state buys agricultural products at standard prices while the peasants suffer no loss, and, what is more, our purchase prices are gradually being raised. In supplying the peasants with manufactured goods we follow a policy of larger sales at a small profit and of stabilizing or appropriately reducing their prices; in supplying grain to the peasants in grain-deficient areas we generally subsidize such sales to a certain extent. Even so, mistakes of one kind or another will occur if we are not careful. In view of the grave mistakes made by the Soviet Union on this question, we must take greater care and handle the relationship between the state and the peasants well.

Similarly, the relationship between the co-operative and the peasants should be well handled. What proportion of the earnings of a co-operative should go to the state, to the co-operative and to the peasants respectively and in what form should be determined properly. The amount that goes to the co-operative is used directly to serve the peasants. Production expenses need no explanation, management expenses are also necessary, the accumulation fund is for expanded reproduction and the public welfare fund is for the peasants' well-being. However, together with the peasants, we should work out equitable ratios among these items. We must strictly economize on

production and management expenses. The accumulation fund and the public welfare fund must also be kept within limits, and one shouldn't expect all good things to be done in a single year.

Except in case of extraordinary natural disasters, we must see to it that, given increased agricultural production, 90 per cent of the co-operative members get some increase in their income and the other 10 per cent break even each year, and if the latter's income should fall, ways must be found to solve the problem in good time.

In short, consideration must be given to both sides, not to just one, whether they are the state and the factory, the state and the worker, the factory and the worker, the state and the co-operative, the state and the peasant, or the co-operative and the peasant. To give consideration to only one side, whichever it may be, is harmful to socialism and to the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a big question which concerns 600 million people, and it calls for repeated education in the whole Party and the whole nation.

V. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES

The relationship between the central and the local authorities constitutes another contradiction. To resolve this contradiction, our attention should now be focussed on how to enlarge the powers of the local authorities to some extent, give them greater independence and let them do more, all on the premise that the unified leadership of the central authorities is to be strengthened. This will be advantageous to our task of building a powerful socialist country. Our territory is so vast, our population is so large and the conditions are so complex that it is far better to have the initiative come from both the central and the local authorities than from one source alone. We must not follow the example of the Soviet Union in concentrating everything in the hands of the central authorities, shackling the local authorities and denying them the right to independent action.

The central authorities want to develop industry, and so do the local authorities. Even industries directly under the central authorities need assistance from the local authorities. And all the more so for agriculture and commerce. In short, if we are to promote socialist

construction, we must bring the initiative of the local authorities into play. If we are to strengthen the central authorities, we must attend to the interests of the localities.

At present scores of hands are reaching out to the localities, making things difficult for them. Once a ministry is set up, it wants to have a revolution and so it issues orders. Since the ministries don't think it proper to issue orders to the Party committees and people's councils at the provincial level, they establish direct contact with the relevant departments and bureaus in the provinces and municipalities and give them orders every day. These orders are all supposed to come from the central authorities, even though neither the Central Committee of the Party nor the State Council knows anything about them, and they put a great strain on the local authorities. There is such a flood of statistical forms that they become a scourge. This state of affairs must be changed.

We should encourage the style of work in which the local authorities are consulted on the matters to be taken up. It is the practice of the Central Committee of the Party to consult the local authorities; it never hastily issues orders without prior consultation. We hope that the ministries and departments under the central authorities will pay due attention to this and will first confer with the localities on all matters concerning them and issue no order without full consultation.

The central departments fall into two categories. Those in the first category exercise leadership right down to the enterprises, but their administrative offices and enterprises in the localities are also subject to supervision by the local authorities. Those in the second have the task of laying down guiding principles and mapping out work plans, while the local authorities assume the responsibility for putting them into operation.

For a large country like ours and a big Party like ours the proper handling of the relationship between the central and local authorities is of vital importance. Some capitalist countries pay great attention to this too. Although their social system is fundamentally different from ours, the experience of their growth is nevertheless worth studying. Take our own experience; the system of the greater administrative area instituted in the early days of our People's Republic was a necessity at that time, and yet it had shortcomings which were later exploited to a certain extent by the anti-Party alliance of Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih. It was subsequently decided to abolish the greater administrative

areas and put the various provinces directly under the central authorities; that was a correct decision. But neither was the outcome so satisfactory when matters went to the length of depriving the localities of their necessary independence. According to our Constitution, the legislative powers are all vested in the central authorities. But, provided that the policies of the central authorities are not violated, the local authorities may work out rules, regulations and measures in the light of their specific conditions and the needs of their work, and this is in no way prohibited by the Constitution. We want both unity and particularity. To build a powerful socialist country it is imperative to have a strong and unified central leadership and unified planning and discipline throughout the country; disruption of this indispensable unity is impermissible. At the same time, it is essential to bring the initiative of the local authorities into full play and let each locality enjoy the particularity suited to its local conditions. This particularity is not the Kao Kang type of particularity but one that is necessary for the interest of the whole and for the strengthening of national unity.

There is also the relationship between different local authorities, and here I refer chiefly to the relationship between the higher and lower local authorities. Since the provinces and municipalities have their own complaints about the central departments, can it be that the prefectures, counties, districts and townships have no complaints about the provinces and municipalities? The central authorities should take care to give scope to the initiative of the provinces and municipalities, and the latter in their turn should do the same for the prefectures, counties, districts and townships; in neither case should the lower levels be put in a strait-jacket. Of course comrades at the lower levels must be informed of the matters on which centralization is necessary and they must not act as they please. In short, centralization must be enforced where it is possible and necessary, otherwise it should not be imposed at all. The provinces and municipalities, prefectures, counties, districts and townships should all enjoy their own proper independence and rights and should fight for them. To fight for such rights in the interest of the whole nation and not of the locality cannot be called localism or an undue assertion of independence.

The relationship between different provinces and municipalities is also a kind of relationship between different local authorities, and it should be properly handled too. It is our consistent principle to

advocate consideration for the general interest and mutual help and accommodation.

Our experience is still insufficient and immature on the question of handling the relationship between the central and local authorities and that between different local authorities. We hope that you will consider and discuss it in earnest and sum up your experience from time to time so as to enhance achievements and overcome shortcomings.

VI. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HAN NATIONALITY AND THE MINORITY NATIONALITIES

Comparatively speaking, our policy on the relationship between the Han nationality and the minority nationalities is sound and has won the favour of the minority nationalities. We put the emphasis on opposing Han chauvinism. Local-nationality chauvinism must be opposed too, but generally that is not where our emphasis lies.

The population of the minority nationalities in our country is small, but the area they inhabit is large. The Han people comprise 94 per cent of the total population, an overwhelming majority. If they practised Han chauvinism and discriminated against the minority peoples, that would be very bad. And who has more land? The minority nationalities, who occupy so to 60 per cent of the territory. We say China is a country vast in territory, rich in resources and large in population; as a matter of fact, it is the Han nationality whose population is large and the minority nationalities whose territory is vast and whose resources are rich, or at least in all probability their resources under the soil are rich.

The minority nationalities have all contributed to the making of China's history. The huge Han population is the result of the intermingling of many nationalities over a long time. All through the ages, the reactionary rulers, chiefly from the Han nationality, sowed feelings of estrangement among our various nationalities and bullied the minority peoples. Even among the working people it is not easy to eliminate the resultant influences in a short time. So we have to make extensive and sustained efforts to educate both the cadres and the masses in our proletarian nationality policy and make a point of frequently reviewing the relationship between the Han nationality and the minority nationalities. One such review was made two years ago

and there should be another now. If the relationship is found to be abnormal, then we must deal with it in earnest and not just in words.

We need to make a thorough study of what systems of economic management and finance will suit the minority nationality areas.

We must sincerely and actively help the minority nationalities to develop their economy and culture. In the Soviet Union the relationship between the Russian nationality and the minority nationalities is very abnormal; we should draw lessons from this. The air in the atmosphere, the forests on the earth and the riches under the soil are all important factors needed for the building of socialism, but no material factor can be exploited and utilized without the human factor. We must foster good relations between the Han nationality and the minority nationalities and strengthen the unity of all the nationalities in the common endeavour to build our great socialist motherland.

VII. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTY AND NON-PARTY

Which is better, to have just one party or several? As we see it now, it's perhaps better to have several parties. This has been true in the past and may well be so for the future; it means long-term coexistence and mutual supervision.

In our country the various democratic parties, consisting primarily of the national bourgeoisie and its intellectuals, emerged during the resistance to Japan and the struggle against Chiang Kai-shek, and they continue to exist to this day. In this respect, China is different from the Soviet Union. We have purposely let the democratic parties remain, giving them opportunities to express their views and adopting a policy of both unity and struggle towards them. We unite with all those democratic personages who offer us well-intentioned criticisms. We should go on activating the enthusiasm of such people from the Kuomintang army and government as Wei Li-huang and Weng Wen-hao, who are patriotic. We should even provide for such abusive types as Lung Yun, Liang Shu-ming and Peng Yi-hu and allow them to rail at us, while refuting their nonsense and accepting what makes sense in their rebukes. This is better for the Party, for the people and for socialism.

Since classes and class struggle still exist in China, there is bound to be opposition in one form or another. Although all the democratic parties and democrats without party affiliation have professed their acceptance of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, many of them are actually in opposition in varying degrees. On such matters as "carrying the revolution through to the end", the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea and the agrarian reform, they were against us and yet not against us. To this very day they have reservations about the suppression of counter-revolutionaries. They didn't want to have a constitution of the socialist type, for, as they said, the Common Programme was just perfect, and yet when the Draft Constitution came out, their hands all went up in favour. Things often turn into their opposites, and this is also true of the attitude of the democratic parties on many questions. They are in opposition, and yet not in opposition, often proceeding from being in opposition to not being in opposition.

The Communist Party and the democratic parties are all products of history. What emerges in history disappears in history. Therefore, the Communist Party will disappear one day, and so will the democratic parties. Is this disappearance so unpleasant? In my opinion, it will be very pleasant. I think it is just fine that one day we will be able to do away with the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our task is to hasten their extinction. We have spoken about this point many times.

But at present we cannot do without the proletarian party and the dictatorship of the proletariat and, what is more, it is imperative that they should be made still more powerful. Otherwise, we would not be able to suppress the counter-revolutionaries, resist the imperialists and build socialism, or consolidate it when it is built. Lenin's theory on the proletarian party and the dictatorship of the proletariat is by no means "outmoded", as alleged by certain people. The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot but be highly coercive. Still, we must oppose bureaucracy and a cumbersome apparatus. I propose that the Party and government organs should be thoroughly streamlined and cut by two-thirds provided that no person dies and no work stops.

However, streamlining the Party and government organs does not mean getting rid of the democratic parties. I suggest you give attention to our united front work so as to improve our relations with them and make every possible effort to mobilize their enthusiasm for the cause of socialism.

VIII. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION

What kind of factor are counter-revolutionaries? They are a negative factor, a destructive factor, they are forces opposed to the positive factors. Is it possible for counter-revolutionaries to change? The die-hards will undoubtedly never change. However, given the conditions in our country, most of the counter-revolutionaries will eventually change to a greater or lesser extent. Thanks to the correct policy we adopted, many have been transformed into persons no longer opposed to the revolution, and a few have even done some good.

The following points should be affirmed:

First, it should be affirmed that the suppression of counter-revolutionaries in 1951-52 was necessary. There is a view that this campaign needn't have been launched. This is wrong.

Counter-revolutionaries may be dealt with in these ways: execution, imprisonment, supervision and leaving at large. Execution — everybody knows what that means. By imprisonment we mean putting counter-revolutionaries in jail and reforming them through labour. By supervision we mean leaving them in society to be reformed under the supervision of the masses. By leaving at large we mean that generally no arrest is made in those cases where it is marginal whether to make an arrest, or that those arrested are set free for good behaviour. It is essential that different counter-revolutionaries should be dealt with differently on the merits of each case.

Now let's take execution in particular. True, we executed a number of people during the above-mentioned campaign to suppress counter-revolutionaries. But what sort of people were they? They were counter-revolutionaries who owed the masses many blood debts and were bitterly hated. In a great revolution embracing 600 million people, the masses would not have been able to rise if we had not killed off such local despots as the "Tyrant of the East" and the "Tyrant of the West". Had it not been for that campaign of suppression, the people would not have approved our present policy of leniency. Now that some people have heard that Stalin wrongly put a number of people to death, they jump to the conclusion that we too were wrong in putting those counter-revolutionaries to death. This is a wrong view. It is of immediate significance today to affirm that it was absolutely right to execute those counter-revolutionaries.

Second, it should be affirmed that counter-revolutionaries still exist, although their number has greatly diminished. After the Hu Feng case surfaced, it was necessary to ferret out the counter-revolutionaries. The effort to clear out those who remain hidden must go on. It should be affirmed that there are still a small number of counter-revolutionaries carrying out counter-revolutionary sabotage of one kind or another. For example, they kill cattle, set fire to granaries, wreck factories, steal information and put up reactionary posters. Consequently, it is wrong to say that counter-revolutionaries have been completely eliminated and that we can therefore lay our heads on our pillows and just drop off to sleep. As long as class struggle exists in China and in the world, we should never relax our vigilance. Nevertheless, it would be equally wrong to assert that there are still large numbers of counter-revolutionaries.

Third, from now on there should be fewer arrests and executions in the suppression of counter-revolutionaries in society at large. They are the mortal and immediate enemies of the people and are deeply hated by them, and therefore a small number should be executed. But most of them should be handed over to the agricultural co-operatives and made to work under supervision and be reformed through labour. All the same, we cannot announce that there will be no more executions, and we must not abolish the death penalty.

Fourth, in clearing out counter-revolutionaries in Party and government organs, schools and army units, we must adhere to the policy started in Yen-an of killing none and arresting few. Confirmed counter-revolutionaries are to be screened by the organizations concerned, but they are not to be arrested by the public security bureaus, prosecuted by the procuratorial organs or tried by the law courts. Well over ninety out of every hundred of these counter-revolutionaries should be dealt with in this way. This is what we mean by arresting few. As for executions, kill none.

What kind of people are those we don't execute? We don't execute people like Hu Feng, Pan Han-nien, Jao Shu-shih, or even captured war criminals such as Emperor Pu Yi and Kang Tse. We don't have them executed, not because their crimes don't deserve capital punishment but because such executions would yield no advantage. If one such criminal is executed, a second and a third will be compared with him in their crimes, and then many heads will begin to roll. This is my first point. Second, people may be wrongly executed. Once a head is chopped off, history shows it can't be restored, nor can it grow

again as chives do, after being cut. If you cut off a head by mistake, there is no way to rectify the mistake, even if you want to. The third point is that you will have destroyed a source of evidence. You need evidence in order to suppress counter-revolutionaries. Often one counter-revolutionary serves as a living witness against another, and there will be cases where you may want to consult him. If you have got rid of him, you may not be able to get evidence any more. And this will be to the advantage of counter-revolution, not of revolution. The fourth point is that killing these counter-revolutionaries won't (1) raise production, (2) raise the country's scientific level, (3) help do away with the four pests, (4) strengthen national defence, or (5) help recover Taiwan. It will only earn you the reputation of killing captives, and killing captives has always given one a bad name. Another point is that counter-revolutionaries inside Party and government organs are different from those in society at large. The latter lord it over the masses while the former are somewhat removed from the masses, and therefore make enemies in general but seldom enemies in particular. What harm is there in killing none of them? Those who are physically fit for manual labour should be reformed through labour, and those who are not should be provided for. Counter-revolutionaries are trash, they are vermin, but once in your hands, you can make them perform some kind of service for the people.

But shall we enact a law stipulating that no counter-revolutionary in Party and government organs is to be executed? Ours is a policy for internal observance which need not be made public, and all we need do is carry it out as far as possible in practice. Supposing someone should throw a bomb into this building, killing everybody here, or half or one-third of the people present, what would you say — execute him or not execute him? Certainly he must be executed.

Adopting the policy of killing none when eliminating counter-revolutionaries from Party and government organs in no way prevents us from being strict with them. Instead, it serves as a safeguard against irretrievable mistakes, and if mistakes are made, it gives us an opportunity to correct them. In this way many people will be put at ease and distrust among comrades inside the Party avoided. If counter-revolutionaries are not executed, they have to be fed. All counter-revolutionaries should be given a chance to earn a living, so that they can start anew. This will be good for the cause of the people and be well received abroad.

The suppression of counter-revolutionaries still calls for hard work. We must not relax. In future not only must the suppression of counter-revolutionaries in society continue, but we must also uncover all the hidden counter-revolutionaries in Party and government organs, schools and army units. We must draw a clear distinction between ourselves and the enemy. If the enemy is allowed to worm his way into our ranks and even into our organs of leadership, we know only too well how serious a threat this will be to the cause of socialism and to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

IX. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RIGHT AND WRONG

A clear distinction must be made between right and wrong, whether inside or outside the Party. How to deal with people who have made mistakes is an important question. The correct attitude towards them should be to adopt a policy of "learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient", help them correct their mistakes and allow them to go on taking part in the revolution. In those days when the dogmatists headed by Wang Ming were in the saddle, our Party erred on this question, picking up the bad aspect of Stalin's style of work. In society the dogmatists rejected the middle forces and inside the Party they did not allow people to correct their mistakes; they barred both from the revolution.

The True Story of Ah Q is a fine story. I would recommend comrades who have read it before to reread it and those who haven't to read it carefully. In this story Lu Hsun writes mainly about a peasant who is backward and politically unawakened. He devotes a whole chapter, "Barred from the Revolution", to describing how a bogus foreign devil bars Ah Q from the revolution. Actually, all Ah Q understands by revolution is helping himself to a few things just like some others. But even this kind of revolution is denied him by the bogus foreign devil. It seems to me that in this respect some people are quite like that bogus foreign devil. They barred from the revolution those who had committed errors, drawing no distinction between the making of mistakes and counter-revolution, and went so far as to

kill a number of people who were guilty only of mistakes. We must take this lesson to heart. It is bad either to bar people outside the Party from the revolution or to prohibit erring comrades inside the Party from making amends.

With regard to comrades who have erred, some people say we must observe them and see if they are going to correct their mistakes. I would say just observing them will not do, we must help them correct their mistakes. That is to say, first we must observe and second we must give help. Everybody needs help; those who have not done wrong need it and those who have need it still more. Probably no one is free from mistakes, only some make more and some less, and once they do they need help. It is passive just to observe; conditions must be created to help those who have erred to mend their ways. A clear distinction must be drawn between right and wrong, for inner-Party controversies over principle are a reflection inside the Party of the class struggle in society, and no equivocation is to be tolerated. It is normal, in accordance with the merits of the case, to mete out appropriate and well grounded criticism to comrades who have erred, and even to conduct necessary struggle against them; this is to help them correct mistakes. To deny them help and, what is worse, to gloat over their mistakes, is sectarianism.

For revolution, it is always better to have more people. Except for a few who cling to their mistakes and fail to mend their ways after repeated admonition, the majority of those who have erred can correct their mistakes. People who have had typhoid become immune to it; similarly, people who have made mistakes will make fewer ones provided they are good at drawing lessons. On the other hand, since it is easier for those who have not erred to become cocky, they are prone to make mistakes. Let us be careful, for those who fix people guilty of mistakes will more often than not end up finding themselves in a fix. Kao Kang started out to lift a rock to hurl at others only to find himself being knocked down. Treating with good will those who have erred will win general approval and unite people. A helpful attitude or a hostile attitude towards comrades who have erred — this is a criterion for judging whether one is well-intentioned or ill-intentioned.

The policy of “learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient” is a policy for uniting the whole Party. We must stick to this policy.

X. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHINA AND OTHER COUNTRIES

We have put forward the slogan of learning from other countries. I think we have been right. At present, the leaders of some countries are chary and even afraid of advancing this slogan. It takes some courage to do so, because theatrical pretensions have to be discarded.

It must be admitted that every nation has its strong points. If not, how can it survive? How can it progress? On the other hand, every nation has its weak points. Some believe that socialism is just perfect, without a single flaw. How can that be true? It must be recognized that there are always two aspects, the strong points and the weak points. The secretaries of our Party branches, the company commanders and platoon leaders of our army have all learned to jot down both aspects in their pocket notebooks, the weak points as well as the strong ones, when summing up their experience. They all know there are two aspects to everything, why do we mention only one? There will always be two aspects, even ten thousand years from now. Each age, whether the future or the present, has its own two aspects, and each individual has his own two aspects. In short, there are two aspects, not just one. To say there is only one is to be aware of one aspect and to be ignorant of the other.

Our policy is to learn from the strong points of all nations and all countries, learn all that is genuinely good in the political, economic, scientific and technological fields and in literature and art. But we must learn with an analytical and critical eye, not blindly, and we mustn't copy everything indiscriminately and transplant mechanically. Naturally, we mustn't pick up their shortcomings and weak points.

We should adopt the same attitude in learning from the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Some of our people were not clear about this before and even picked up their weaknesses. While they were swelling with pride over what they had picked up, it was already being discarded in those countries; as a result, they had to do a somersault like the Monkey Sun Wu-kung. For instance, there were people who accused us of making a mistake of principle in setting up a Ministry of Culture and a Bureau of Cinematography rather than a Ministry of Cinematography and a Bureau of Culture, as was the case in the Soviet Union. They did not anticipate that shortly afterwards the Soviet Union would make a change and set

up a Ministry of Culture as we had done. Some people never take the trouble to analyse, they simply follow the "wind". Today, when the north wind is blowing, they join the "north wind" school; tomorrow, when there is a west wind, they switch to the "west wind" school; afterwards when the north wind blows again, they switch back to the "north wind" school. They hold no independent opinion of their own and often go from one extreme to the other.

In the Soviet Union, those who once extolled Stalin to the skies have now in one swoop consigned him to purgatory. Here in China some people are following their example. It is the opinion of the Central Committee that Stalin's mistakes amounted to only 30 per cent of the whole and his achievements to 70 per cent, and that all things considered Stalin was nonetheless a great Marxist. We wrote "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" on the basis of this evaluation. This assessment of 30 per cent for mistakes and 70 per cent for achievements is just about right. Stalin did a number of wrong things in connection with China. The "Left" adventurism pursued by Wang Ming in the latter part of the Second Revolutionary Civil War period and his Right opportunism in the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan can both be traced to Stalin. At the time of the War of Liberation, Stalin first enjoined us not to press on with the revolution, maintaining that if civil war flared up, the Chinese nation would run the risk of destroying itself. Then when fighting did erupt, he took us half seriously, half sceptically. When we won the war, Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of the Tito type, and in 1949 and 1950 the pressure on us was very strong indeed. Even so, we maintain the estimate of 30 per cent for his mistakes and 70 per cent for his achievements. This is only fair.

In the social sciences and in Marxism-Leninism, we must continue to study Stalin diligently wherever he is right. What we must study is all that is universally true and we must make sure that this study is linked with Chinese reality. It would lead to a mess if every single sentence, even of Marx's, were followed. Our theory is an integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. At one time some people in the Party went in for dogmatism, and this came under our criticism. Nevertheless, there is still dogmatism today. It still exists in academic circles and in economic circles too.

In the natural sciences we are rather backward, and here we should make a special effort to learn from foreign countries. And yet we must

learn critically, not blindly. In technology I think first we have to follow others in most cases, and it is better for us to do so, since that is what we are lacking at present and know little about. However, in those cases where we already have clear knowledge, we must not follow others in every detail.

We must firmly reject and criticize all the decadent bourgeois systems, ideologies and ways of life of foreign countries. But this should in no way prevent us from learning the advanced sciences and technologies of capitalist countries and whatever is scientific in the management of their enterprises. In the industrially developed countries they run their enterprises with fewer people and greater efficiency and they know how to do business. All this should be learned well in accordance with our own principles in order to improve our work. Nowadays, those who make English their study no longer work hard at it, and research papers are no longer translated into English, French, German or Japanese for exchange with other countries. This too is a kind of blind prejudice. Neither the indiscriminate rejection of everything foreign, whether scientific, technological or cultural, nor the indiscriminate imitation of everything foreign as noted above, has anything in common with the Marxist attitude, and neither in any way benefits our cause.

In my opinion, China has two weaknesses, which are at the same time two strong points.

First, in the past China was a colonial and semi-colonial country, not an imperialist power, and was always bullied by others. Its industry and agriculture are not developed and its scientific and technological level is low, and except for its vast territory, rich resources, large population, long history, *The Dream of the Red Chamber* in literature, and so on, China is inferior to other countries in many respects, and so has no reason to feel conceited. However, there are people who, having been slaves too long, feel inferior in everything and don't stand up straight in the presence of foreigners. They are just like Chia Kuei³ in the opera *The Famen Temple* who, when asked to take a seat, refuses to do so, giving the excuse that he is used to standing in attendance. Here we need to bestir ourselves, enhance our national confidence and encourage the spirit typified by "scorn U.S. imperialism", which was fostered during the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea.

Second, our revolution came late. Although the Revolution of 1911 which overthrew the Ching emperor preceded the Russian revolution,

there was no Communist Party at that time and the revolution failed. Victory in the people's revolution came only in 1949, some thirty years later than the October Revolution. On this account too, we are not in a position to feel conceited. The Soviet Union differs from our country in that, firstly, tsarist Russia was an imperialist power and, secondly, it had the October Revolution. As a result, many people in the Soviet Union are conceited and very arrogant.

Our two weaknesses are also strong points. As I have said elsewhere, we are first "poor" and second "blank". By "poor" I mean we do not have much industry and our agriculture is underdeveloped. By "blank" I mean we are like a blank sheet of paper and our cultural and scientific level is not high. From the developmental point of view, this is not bad. The poor want revolution, whereas it is difficult for the rich to want revolution. Countries with a high scientific and technological level are overblown with arrogance. We are like a blank sheet of paper, which is good for writing on.

Being "poor" and "blank" is therefore all to our good. Even when one day our country becomes strong and prosperous, we must still adhere to the revolutionary stand, remain modest and prudent, learn from other countries and not allow ourselves to become swollen with conceit. We must not only learn from other countries during the period of our First Five-Year Plan, but must go on doing so after the completion of scores of five-year plans. We must be ready to learn even ten thousand years from now. Is there anything bad about that?

I have taken up ten topics altogether. These ten relationships are all contradictions. The world consists of contradictions. Without contradictions the world would cease to exist. Our task is to handle these contradictions correctly. As to whether or not they can be resolved entirely to our satisfaction in practice, we must be prepared for either possibility; furthermore, in the course of resolving these contradictions we are bound to come up against new ones, new problems. But as we have often said, while the road ahead is tortuous, the future is bright. We must do our best to mobilize all positive factors, both inside and outside the Party, both at home and abroad, both direct and indirect, and make China a powerful socialist country.

NOTES

¹ The system of fixed quotas for the production, purchase and marketing of grain was instituted in the spring of 1955. The quotas for production fixed in that year were based on the grain yield per *mou* in normal years, and increases in production were not to entail extra sales of grain to the state for three years. The fixed quota for purchase refers to the purchase by the state of a fixed proportion of surplus grain from peasant households having a surplus. The fixed quota for marketing refers to the quota for the state's supply of grain to grain-deficient households. The system was adopted in order to raise the peasants' enthusiasm for increasing production.

² The system of obligatory sales enforced in the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1957 was the principal measure by which the state bought agricultural products. Under it the collective farms and individual peasant households were required to sell their agricultural products annually to the state in quantities and at prices fixed by the state.

³ In the Peking opera *The Famen Temple*, Chia Kuei is a trusted lackey of Liu Chin, a Ming Dynasty eunuch.

U.S. IMPERIALISM IS A PAPER TIGER

July 14, 1956

The United States is flaunting the anti-communist banner everywhere in order to perpetrate aggression against other countries.

The United States owes debts everywhere. It owes debts not only to the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa, but also to the countries of Europe and Oceania. The whole world, Britain included, dislikes the United States. The masses of the people dislike it. Japan dislikes the United States because it oppresses her. None of the countries in the East is free from U.S. aggression. The United States has invaded our Taiwan Province. Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Viet Nam and Pakistan all suffer from U.S. aggression, although some of them are allies of the United States. The people are dissatisfied and in some countries so are the authorities.

All oppressed nations want independence.

Everything is subject to change. The big decadent forces will give way to the small new-born forces. The small forces will change into big forces because the majority of the people demand this change. The U.S. imperialist forces will change from big to small because the American people, too, are dissatisfied with their government.

In my own lifetime I myself have witnessed such changes. Some of us present were born in the Ching Dynasty and others after the 1911 Revolution.

The Ching Dynasty was overthrown long ago. By whom? By the party led by Sun Yat-sen, together with the people. Sun Yat-sen's forces were so small that the Ching officials didn't take him seriously. He led many uprisings which failed each time. In the end, however, it was Sun Yat-sen who brought down the Ching Dynasty. Bigness is nothing to be afraid of. The big will be overthrown by the small. The small will become big. After overthrowing the Ching Dynasty, Sun Yat-sen

Part of a talk with two Latin-American public figures.

met with defeat. For he failed to satisfy the demands of the people, such as their demands for land and for opposition to imperialism. Nor did he understand the necessity of suppressing the counter-revolutionaries who were then moving about freely. Later, he suffered defeat at the hands of Yuan Shih-kai, the chieftain of the Northern warlords. Yuan Shih-kai's forces were larger than Sun Yat-sen's. But here again this law operated: small forces linked with the people become strong, while big forces opposed to the people become weak. Subsequently Sun Yat-sen's bourgeois-democratic revolutionaries co-operated with us Communists and together we defeated the warlord set-up left behind by Yuan Shih-kai.

Chiang Kai-shek's rule in China was recognized by the governments of all countries and lasted twenty-two years, and his forces were the biggest. Our forces were small, fifty thousand Party members at first but only a few thousand after counter-revolutionary suppressions. The enemy made trouble everywhere. Again this law operated: the big and strong end up in defeat because they are divorced from the people, whereas the small and weak emerge victorious because they are linked with the people and work in their interest. That's how things turned out in the end.

During the anti-Japanese war, Japan was very powerful, the Kuomintang troops were driven to the hinterland, and the armed forces led by the Communist Party could only conduct guerrilla warfare in the rural areas behind the enemy lines. Japan occupied large Chinese cities such as Peking, Tientsin, Shanghai, Nanking, Wuhan and Canton. Nevertheless, like Germany's Hitler the Japanese militarists collapsed in a few years, in accordance with the same law.

We underwent innumerable difficulties and were driven from the south to the north, while our forces fell from several hundred thousand strong to a few tens of thousands. At the end of the 25,000-*li* Long March we had only 25,000 men left.

In the history of our Party many erroneous "Left" and Right lines have occurred. Gravest of all were the Right deviationist line of Chen Tu-hsiu and the "Left" deviationist line of Wang Ming. Besides, there were the Right deviationist errors committed by Chang Kuo-tao, Kao Kang and others.

There is also a good side to mistakes, for they can educate the people and the Party. We have had a good many teachers by negative example, such as Japan, the United States, Chiang Kai-shek, Chen Tu-hsiu, Li Li-san, Wang Ming, Chang Kuo-tao and Kao Kang. We

paid a very high price to learn from these teachers by negative example. In the past, Britain made war on us many times. Britain, the United States, Japan, France, Germany, Italy, tsarist Russia and Holland were all very interested in this land of ours. They were all our teachers by negative example and we were their pupils.

During the War of Resistance, our troops grew and became 900,000 strong through fighting against Japan. Then came the War of Liberation. Our arms were inferior to those of the Kuomintang. The Kuomintang troops then numbered four million, but in three years of fighting we wiped out eight million of them all told. The Kuomintang, though aided by U.S. imperialism, could not defeat us. The big and strong cannot win, it is always the small and weak who win out.

Now U.S. imperialism is quite powerful, but in reality it isn't. It is very weak politically because it is divorced from the masses of the people and is disliked by everybody and by the American people too. In appearance it is very powerful but in reality it is nothing to be afraid of, it is a paper tiger. Outwardly a tiger, it is made of paper, unable to withstand the wind and the rain. I believe the United States is nothing but a paper tiger.

History as a whole, the history of class society for thousands of years, has proved this point: the strong must give way to the weak. This holds true for the Americas as well.

Only when imperialism is eliminated can peace prevail. The day will come when the paper tigers will be wiped out. But they won't become extinct of their own accord, they need to be battered by the wind and the rain.

When we say U.S. imperialism is a paper tiger, we are speaking in terms of strategy. Regarding it as a whole, we must despise it. But regarding each part, we must take it seriously. It has claws and fangs. We have to destroy it piecemeal. For instance, if it has ten fangs, knock off one the first time, and there will be nine left; knock off another, and there will be eight left. When all the fangs are gone, it will still have claws. If we deal with it step by step and in earnest, we will certainly succeed in the end.

Strategically, we must utterly despise U.S. imperialism. Tactically, we must take it seriously. In struggling against it, we must take each battle, each encounter, seriously. At present, the United States is powerful, but when looked at in a broader perspective, as a whole and from a long-term viewpoint, it has no popular support, its policies are disliked by the people, because it oppresses and exploits them.

For this reason, the tiger is doomed. Therefore, it is nothing to be afraid of and can be despised. But today the United States still has strength, turning out more than 100 million tons of steel a year and hitting out everywhere. That is why we must continue to wage struggles against it, fight it with all our might and wrest one position after another from it. And that takes time.

It seems that the countries of the Americas, Asia and Africa will have to go on quarrelling with the United States till the very end, till the paper tiger is destroyed by the wind and the rain.

To oppose U.S. imperialism, people of European origin in the Latin-American countries should unite with the indigenous Indians. Perhaps the white immigrants from Europe can be divided into two groups, one composed of rulers and the other of ruled. This should make it easier for the group of oppressed white people to get close to the local people, for their position is the same.

Our friends in Latin America, Asia and Africa are in the same position as we and are doing the same kind of work, doing something for the people to lessen their oppression by imperialism. If we do a good job, we can root out imperialist oppression. In this we are comrades.

We are of the same nature as you in our opposition to imperialist oppression, differing only in geographical position, nationality and language. But we are different in nature from imperialism, and the very sight of it makes us sick.

What use is imperialism? The Chinese people will have none of it, nor will the people in the rest of the world. There is no reason for the existence of imperialism.

STRENGTHEN PARTY UNITY AND CARRY FORWARD PARTY TRADITIONS

August 30, 1956

Today we begin the preparatory meeting for the Eighth National Congress. The meeting will last about a fortnight and its main business is: (1) drafting documents for the congress; (2) conducting a preliminary election of the Central Committee; and (3) preparing speeches for the congress.

Now let me deal with a few points.

First, about the objectives and purposes of the congress. What problems is this congress to solve and what are its objectives? In a word, it is to sum up the experience gained since the Seventh Congress, unite the whole Party and unite with all the forces at home and abroad that can be united in the struggle to build a great socialist China.

About the summing-up of experience. Although we have a rich store of experience, we should not merely juxtapose a host of facts but should sum up by grasping the essentials, proceeding from reality and adopting a Marxist standpoint. A summing-up in this way will stimulate our whole Party and enable us to do our work better.

Our Party is a great, glorious and correct Party, a fact which is acknowledged by the whole world. In the past, some foreign comrades had doubts about what we were actually doing. Many didn't understand our policy towards the national bourgeoisie, nor were they very clear about our rectification movement. Today I would say more have come to understand them and most can be said to have such an understanding. Of course, there are still some who don't. Within the country and even inside the Party, there are some who don't understand and who maintain that the line we have followed since the Seventh Congress is not necessarily so correct. But the facts are

Speech at the first session of the preparatory meeting for the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party.

there for all to see, we have carried out two revolutions — the bourgeois-democratic revolution to seize state power and the proletarian socialist revolution to carry out socialist transformation and build a socialist country. In the eleven years since the Seventh Congress we have scored great successes, and this is acknowledged by the whole nation and the whole world. Even the bourgeoisie abroad has to acknowledge it. The two revolutions prove that the line of the Central Committee since the Seventh Congress has been correct.

The October Revolution overthrew the bourgeoisie, an event without precedent in world history. In all countries the bourgeoisie was sweeping in its denunciation of this revolution and had never a good word for it. The bourgeoisie in Russia was a counter-revolutionary class, it rejected state capitalism at that time, organized slow-downs and sabotage and resorted to the gun. The Russian proletariat had no choice but to finish it off. This infuriated the bourgeoisie in other countries, and they became abusive. Here in China we have been relatively moderate with our national bourgeoisie, who feel a little more comfortable and believe there are some good points in our policy. By prohibiting American journalists from coming to China, Eisenhower and Dulles have now in fact admitted that it does have good points. If things were in an awful mess here, they would have let their journalists come, knowing that the result could only be vicious articles. What they dread most is that the articles might include not only invective but a good word here and there, and that would be awkward for them.

China used to be stigmatized as a “decrepit empire”, “the sick man of East Asia”, a country with a backward economy and a backward culture, with no hygiene, poor at ball games and swimming, where the women had bound feet, the men wore pigtailed and eunuchs could still be found, and where the moon was inferior and did not shine as brightly as in foreign lands. In short, there was much that was bad in China. But after six years’ work of transformation we have changed the face of China. No one can deny our achievements.

Our Party is the core leading our revolutionary cause forward. In summing up experience the congress must first and foremost aim at achieving greater unity throughout the Party. Up to June Party membership stood at 10,730,000. A great deal of work must be done to educate, enlighten and unite these more than ten million Party members, so that they can play their role as the core among the people better. By itself the Party is not enough, it is only the core and needs

a mass following. In all fields, including industry, agriculture, commerce, culture and education, 90 per cent of the work is done by non-Party people and not by Party members. Therefore, we must strive hard to unite with the masses, unite and work with all those that can be united. In our past efforts to achieve unity inside the Party and with people outside the Party there were many defects. During and after the congress we must conduct propaganda and carry on education so that our work in this respect will be considerably improved.

Internationally, we must unite with all the forces in the world that can be united, first of all with the Soviet Union, the fraternal Parties, the fraternal countries and their people, and also with all the peace-loving countries and people, and we must enlist the support of all useful forces. Delegates of Communist Parties from over fifty countries will attend our congress, and this is very good. In the past we had not seized state power or won victory in the two revolutions and had no success to speak of in construction. It is quite different now. We are held in fairly high esteem by our foreign comrades.

What is our objective in uniting with all the forces that can be united, inside and outside the Party and at home and abroad? It is to build a great socialist country. A country like ours may and ought to be described as "great". Our Party is a great Party, our people a great people, our revolution a great revolution, and our construction is great, too. Only one country on this globe has a population of 600 million, and that is China. In the past there were reasons for others to look down upon us. For we had little to contribute, steel output registered only several hundred thousand tons a year, and even that was in the hands of the Japanese. Under the despotic rule of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, which lasted twenty-two years, steel output was only some tens of thousands of tons a year. We still don't have much steel, but a promising start has been made. Output this year will be over four million tons, it will hit the five million mark next year, will exceed ten million tons after the Second Five-Year Plan and is likely to top twenty million after the Third. We must work hard to reach this target. There are about a hundred countries in the world, but only a few produce over twenty million tons of steel a year. Therefore, once built up, China will be a great socialist country and will radically transform the situation in which for over a century it was backward, despised and wretched. Moreover, it will be able to catch up with the most powerful capitalist country in the world, the United States. The United States has a population of only 170 million, and

as we have a population several times larger, are similarly rich in resources and are favoured with more or less the same kind of climate, it is possible for us to catch up with the United States. Oughtn't we to catch up? Definitely yes. What are your 600 million people doing? Dozing? Which is right, dozing or working? If working is the answer, why can't you with your 600 million people produce 200 or 300 million tons of steel when they with their population of 170 million can produce 100 million tons? If you fail to catch up, you cannot justify yourselves and you will not be so glorious or great. The United States has a history of only one hundred and eighty years, and sixty years ago it too produced four million tons of steel, so we are sixty years behind. Given fifty or sixty years, we certainly ought to overtake the United States. This is an obligation. You have such a big population, such a vast territory and such rich resources, and what is more, you are said to be building socialism, which is supposed to be superior; if after working at it for fifty or sixty years you are still unable to overtake the United States, what a sorry figure you will cut! You should be read off the face of the earth. Therefore, to overtake the United States is not only possible, but absolutely necessary and obligatory. If we don't, we the Chinese nation will be letting the nations of the world down and we will not be making much of a contribution to mankind.

Second, about carrying forward the Party's traditions. The congress should carry forward our Party's fine traditions with respect to ideology and style of work. It should effectively combat subjectivism and sectarianism and oppose bureaucracy as well. I won't go into bureaucracy today and will deal only with subjectivism and sectarianism. After being overcome, subjectivism and sectarianism crop up again and have to be overcome again.

By making mistakes, we mean making subjectivist mistakes, following a wrong way of thinking. The many articles we've come across criticizing Stalin's mistakes say little or nothing on this score. Why did Stalin make mistakes? Because on a number of issues his subjective thinking failed to correspond with objective reality. Such cases still happen frequently in our work today. Subjectivism means proceeding not from objective reality and from what is actually possible, but from subjective wishes. What is to be set forth and dealt with in our congress documents should as far as possible conform to or approximate Chinese realities. At the same time, in the light of our experience, we should criticize views running counter to the realities, criticize and combat subjectivism. This was the task we set

ourselves years ago. At present, we are combating subjectivism as found in the socialist revolution and socialist construction. In the course of the democratic revolution we were plagued by subjectivism for a long time and we paid dearly for it, losing practically all our base areas and over 90 per cent of our revolutionary forces, and it was only then that we began to come to our senses. The problem was not straightened out until the rectification movement in Yen-an, which laid stress on investigation and study and a realistic approach. The universal truth of Marxism must be integrated with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, or else we will get nowhere. In other words, theory must be integrated with practice. Integration of theory with practice is one of the fundamental principles of Marxism. According to dialectical materialism, thought must reflect objective reality and must be tested and verified in objective practice before it can be taken as truth, otherwise it cannot. Though we have done well in the last few years, subjectivism is evident everywhere. There will be subjectivism in the future, just as there is today. Subjectivism will always be there, ten thousand years and even a hundred million years from now, and it will be so as long as humanity does not perish. Where there is subjectivism, there are mistakes.

Then there is another phenomenon called sectarianism. A locality has its own over-all interest, a nation has another and the earth yet another. Right now I won't go into matters outside our planet, for the travel routes beyond the earth have not yet been opened. If human beings should be discovered on Mars or Venus, we would then discuss the matter of uniting with them and forming a united front. For the time being, we will confine ourselves to the question of unity in the Party, in the country and in the world. Our principle is to unite with all those who are capable of doing some good for world peace and the cause of human progress, whether they are foreign Communists or foreign non-Party people. First of all, we should unite with the scores of Communist Parties and with the Soviet Union. As some mistakes have occurred in the Soviet Union and there is so much talk and gossip about them, it might seem that these mistakes were terrible. It is wrong to take this view. No nation can be free from mistakes, and since the Soviet Union was the first socialist country in the world and went through so much for so long, it was impossible for it not to make mistakes. Then how should we weigh the Soviet Union's mistakes, for instance those of Stalin? They are of a partial and transitory nature. Although it has come to our ears that certain things

have been going on for twenty years, still they are transitory and partial and can be set right. In the Soviet Union the main trend, the principal aspect, the major part, has been correct. Russia gave birth to Leninism and through the October Revolution became the first socialist country. It built socialism, defeated fascism and became a powerful industrial country. There are a lot of things we can learn from the Soviet Union. Naturally, we should learn from its advanced and not its backward experience. The slogan we have advocated all along is to draw on the advanced Soviet experience. Who told you to pick up its backward experience? Some people are so indiscriminating that they say a Russian fart is fragrant. That too is subjectivism. The Russians themselves say it stinks. Therefore, we should be analytical. As we have indicated elsewhere, the assessment of Stalin should be 70 per cent for achievements and 30 per cent for mistakes. In the case of the Soviet Union what is good and useful makes up the essential and larger part and what is wrong only a small part. We too have things that are not good, and far from letting other countries pick them up, we should dump them. In a way, bad things are also some kind of experience and can serve a useful purpose. We have had people like Chen Tu-hsiu, Li Li-san, Wang Ming, Chang Kuo-tao, Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih, who have served as our teachers. In addition, we have other teachers. Within the country the best among them has been Chiang Kai-shek. Those whom we couldn't convince were convinced right away when Chiang Kai-shek came along to give them a lesson. How did Chiang Kai-shek teach his lessons? He taught with machine-guns, cannon and planes. Imperialism is another teacher that has given our 600 million people an education. For over a century we were oppressed by several imperialist powers, and this has been an education. Therefore, bad things can serve an educational purpose and open our eyes.

As for the fight against sectarianism, one thing in particular should be pointed out, that is, you should unite with those who have waged struggles against you. They came to blows with you, knocked you down, made you suffer and lose face and conferred the "official honour" of opportunist on you, although you were not that bad. If the blow was justified, then it served you right. If you were an opportunist, why shouldn't the blow have been aimed at you? What I am talking about here is the unjustified blows and struggles. Once those who dealt such blows change their attitude and admit that they did wrong in attacking you and that it was not right to proclaim you "king" of the realm of

opportunism, then let the matter end there. If a few don't admit they were wrong, can't you wait? You can, I suppose. By unity we mean uniting with those who have differences with you, who look down on you or show little respect for you, who have had a bone to pick with you or waged struggles against you and at whose hands you have suffered. As for those who see eye to eye with you, you are already united with them, so the question of unity doesn't arise. The trouble here is with those who have yet to be united. We mean those who have opinions differing from yours or who have serious shortcomings. For instance, within our Party at present there are many who have joined the Party only organizationally and not ideologically. They may not have come to blows or crossed swords with you, but as they have not joined the Party ideologically, what they do is inevitably not so satisfactory or is marred by faults, and they may even do some bad things. With regard to such people, we must unite with them and educate and help them. I said before that in dealing with all those who have shortcomings or have made mistakes, we must not only observe whether they are going to mend their ways but should help them correct their mistakes. In other words, we must first observe, and second give help. Merely to observe means to stand by and see how they behave. If they do well, that's fine, and if they don't, let them suffer. This is a passive attitude, not a positive one. Marxists should adopt a positive attitude, that is, help as well as observe.

Third, about the election of the Central Committee. Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping mentioned just now that the Eighth Central Committee will have 150 to 170 members. This is slightly more than twice the size of the Seventh Central Committee with its seventy-seven members and is probably quite appropriate. It will probably be better not to expand the Central Committee further for several years, say, five years. Many capable people doing very useful work today were trained during the War of Resistance Against Japan, and they are known as cadres of the "38 type". They are the mainstay of our work today, and we cannot do without them. But they are numerous, and if arrangements were to be made for them, the number of Central Committee members would have to rise to several hundred. So this time we will not make any such arrangements. We leave to the comrades here to consider whether the figure of 150 to 170 proposed by the Central Committee is appropriate, and if not, what size would be proper.

It should be affirmed that members of the present Central Committee have done good work and lived up to the trust placed in them by

the Seventh Congress. In the past eleven years they have correctly led the Chinese democratic revolution and the socialist revolution and socialist construction without committing grave errors and have waged struggles against opportunism of all descriptions and against what is erroneous, thus overcoming all factors unfavourable to the revolution and construction. They have done well, including some of those comrades who made mistakes before. Here I am speaking of the Central Committee as a whole. As for certain comrades, this assessment does not hold true. Especially for Wang Ming. At the Seventh Congress, in order to get by, he submitted a written statement acknowledging that the line of the Central Committee was correct, accepting its political report to the Seventh Congress and indicating his willingness to abide by its decisions. But when I had a talk with him some time later, he made a right about face, forgetting what he had written. Then he thought it over and said the next day that he had written something in which he did own up to his mistakes. I told him that, even so, if he wanted to deny his mistakes now, he could withdraw that statement. But he didn't. Later at the Second Plenary Session we expressed the hope that he would speak on his mistakes, but instead he digressed, lavishing praises upon us. We told him he could cut that out and speak on the mistakes he, Wang Ming, had made, but he wouldn't hear of it. He promised to write a self-criticism after the session. But later he said that he had been taken ill and was unable to do mental work, and that as soon as he started writing his illness returned. Maybe he was cooking all this up, it's hard to say. He has been feeling unwell and will not be able to attend the congress. Shall we elect him? And Comrade Li Li-san too? More comrades are ready to forgive Li Li-san, whereas there are fewer ready to forgive Wang Ming. As Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping stated, if we elect them the significance will be similar to their election at the Seventh Congress. At that congress, many delegates were unwilling to elect them (not only Wang Ming, but quite a few other comrades as well). We said at the time that we would make a mistake if we adopted such a policy. Why would we have made a mistake if we had not elected those who had erred? Because it would have meant that we were following their example. Their procedure was to reject anyone once labelled by them as an opportunist, regardless of whether or not he had actually made mistakes. If we had followed this procedure, we would have been following their line, the Wang Ming line or the Li Li-san line. We would do nothing of the kind, under no circumstances would we follow the Wang Ming or

the Li Li-san line. The inner-Party relations they cultivated were such that they rejected without exception all those who had made mistakes and those who had waged struggles against them or denounced them as opportunists. They styled themselves 100 per cent Bolsheviks, only to be shown later to be 100 per cent opportunists. On the other hand, it is those of us once labelled by them as "opportunists" who have some grasp of Marxism.

The heart of the matter here is that they are not just a few isolated individuals but represent a substantial part of the petty bourgeoisie. China is a country with a huge petty bourgeoisie. A considerable part of the petty bourgeoisie vacillates. It is plain to all that the well-to-do middle peasants, for instance, invariably vacillate and do not stand firm in any revolution, going wild when elated and burying their heads in dejection when pessimistic. Most of the time their eyes are glued on that precious bit of property they possess, which is no more than one or two draught animals, a cart and a dozen *mou* of land. Swayed by considerations of loss and gain, they are most anxious not to lose these possessions. They are different from the poor peasants. The poor peasants account for 50 per cent of the rural population in northern China and 70 per cent in the south. In terms of class composition, our Party consists chiefly of workers and poor peasants, namely, the proletariat and the semi-proletariat. The semi-proletariat is also petty bourgeois, but they are much more steadfast than the middle peasants. Our Party has also admitted a number of intellectuals into its ranks, and of our more than ten million members, intellectuals of the higher, middle and lower levels total approximately one million. It would not be proper to say that they represent imperialism or that they represent the landlord class, the bureaucrat-capitalist class or the national bourgeoisie; it would be more appropriate to classify them as petty bourgeois. Which part of the petty bourgeoisie do they chiefly represent? That part of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie with more means of production, the well-to-do middle peasants for instance. The intellectuals among our Party members "fear dragons ahead and tigers behind", they constantly waver and are afflicted with a fair amount of subjectivism and no small measure of sectarianism. What does our election of these two persons representing the Wang Ming and Li Li-san lines signify? It signifies that we treat those who have made ideological mistakes differently from those who are counter-revolutionaries and splittists (people like Chen Tu-hsiu, Chang Kuo-tao, Kao

Kang and Jao Shu-shih). Wang Ming and Li Li-san went about their subjectivism and sectarianism in an open way and with a great fanfare, trying to overwhelm people with their political programmes. Wang Ming had his own political programme and so did Li Li-san. Of course, Chen Tu-hsiu had one of his own too, but he went the Trotskyite way, worked for a split and carried on activities against the Party from the outside. Chang Kuo-tao was engaged in conspiracy and splittism and eventually went over to the Kuomintang. Therefore the question of Wang Ming and Li Li-san is not just a question of two individuals, what is important here is that there are underlying social causes. One of their manifestations in our Party is that quite a number of members tend to vacillate at critical junctures. These vacillating elements are opportunistic. That is to say, such people do one thing if they can get something out of it and switch to another if that benefits them. They have no definite principles, no definite rules of conduct and no definite orientation, going this way today and that tomorrow. Wang Ming, for instance, is just like that. First he was "Left" in the extreme and later he became Right in the extreme.

At the Seventh Congress, we convinced many comrades and had Wang Ming and Li Li-san elected. In the eleven years since, have we suffered any loss in consequence? No, none at all. We did not fail in our revolution, nor was our victory delayed by a few months just because we had elected Wang Ming and Li Li-san.

Does their election mean encouragement for people who have made mistakes? "Now that people who have made mistakes are on the Central Committee, let us all make mistakes, then we too will have a chance of being elected!" Will this happen? No, it won't. Look, not one of our seventy or so Central Committee members has gone out of his way to make a few mistakes in order to get re-elected. As for those who are not Central Committee members, whether they joined the revolution before, during or after the year 1938, will they follow the example of Wang Ming and Li Li-san and come up with another two lines — to make a total of four — just to get themselves elected to the Central Committee? No, they won't, nobody will do that. On the contrary, drawing lessons from their mistakes, our comrades will become more prudent.

There is another point. In the past one heard such talk as "better join the revolution late than early, or better still, don't join the

revolution at all". Now, will the election of Wang Ming and Li Li-san create the impression in the Party that it is better to be wrong than right, better to make big mistakes than small ones? If Wang Ming and Li Li-san who have made mistakes on the Party line are now to be elected to the Central Committee, comrades who have proved themselves correct or have made only small mistakes will have to yield two seats to them. Isn't this arrangement the most unfair thing in the world? Judged in that light, it is indeed unfair. You see, those who have proved themselves correct or have made only small mistakes have to make room for those who have made big ones. It is obviously unfair, there is no fairness whatsoever in it. If a comparison is made this way, it must be conceded that it is better to be wrong than right, better to make big mistakes than small ones. But judged from another angle, the case is different. Their mistakes on the Party line are known all over the country and throughout the world, and the fact that they are well known is precisely the reason for electing them. What can you do about it? They are well known, but you who have made no mistakes or have made only small ones don't have as big a reputation as theirs. In a country like ours with its very large petty bourgeoisie they are standards. If we elect them, many people will say, "The Communist Party continues to be patient with them and is willing to give up two seats to them in the hope that they will mend their ways." Whether they will or not is another matter, which is inconsequential, involving as it does only the two of them. The point is that in our society the petty bourgeoisie is vast in number, that in our Party there are many vacillating elements of petty-bourgeois origin and that among the intellectuals there are many such vacillating elements; they all want to see what will happen to these test cases. When they see these two standards still there, they will feel comfortable, they will sleep well and be pleased. If you haul down the two standards, they may panic. Therefore, it is not a question of whether Wang Ming and Li Li-san will mend their ways, that does not matter very much. What matters is that the millions of Party members of petty-bourgeois origin who are prone to vacillate, and the intellectuals in particular, are watching the kind of attitude we take towards Wang Ming and Li Li-san. This is like our treatment of the rich peasants in the agrarian reform; when we left the rich peasants untouched, the middle peasants were at ease. If we adopt the same attitude towards these two men at the Eighth Congress as we did at the Seventh, our Party will have something to gain, to derive benefit

from, that is, the task of remoulding the masses of the petty bourgeoisie throughout the country will be easier. This will also have an influence in the world. Few countries, or one can say none, adopt the attitude we do towards persons who have made mistakes.

The preparatory meeting for the congress will last only about a fortnight, counting from today, but if arrangements are made properly, it is entirely possible to do a good job of the preparations. We are certain that the congress will be a success and that with their political level the delegates will assure its success. But all of us must be conscientious and do our very best.

SOME EXPERIENCES IN OUR PARTY'S HISTORY

September 25, 1956

U.S. imperialism is your adversary as well as ours and the adversary of the people of the world. It is harder for U.S. imperialism to interfere in our affairs than in yours. For one thing, the United States is far away from us. But U.S. imperialism has reached out very far, to our Taiwan, to Japan, south Korea, south Viet Nam, the Philippines, and so on. The United States has stationed its troops in Britain, France, Italy, Iceland and West Germany and has set up military bases in North Africa and in the Middle and Near East. It has reached out to every corner of the earth. It is a global imperialism. It is a teacher by negative example to the people of all countries. The people of the world should unite and help each other to chop off the tentacles of U.S. imperialism wherever they reach. Each time we chop off one of its tentacles, we will be a little more comfortable.

In the past China was also a country oppressed by imperialism and feudalism, so our conditions and yours are quite similar. A large rural population and the existence of feudal forces are liabilities for a country, but they are assets for a revolution led by the proletariat because they provide us with a broad ally in the peasants. In Russia before the October Revolution, feudalism was strong, and it was with the support of the peasant masses that the Bolshevik Party won victory in the revolution. This was even more so in China. Ours is an agricultural country, with over 500 million people living in the countryside. In the past we relied mainly on the peasants in fighting. Now also it is because the peasants are organized and agriculture has become co-operative that our urban bourgeoisie has quickly submitted to socialist transformation. Hence the vital importance of the Party's work among the peasants.

Part of a talk with representatives of some Latin-American Communist Parties.

I think that in countries where feudalism is strong the political party of the proletariat should go to the countryside and seek out the peasants. When intellectuals go to the countryside to seek out the peasants, they cannot win their trust unless they have the right attitude. City intellectuals know little about rural affairs and peasant psychology, and they never can solve the peasants' problems in quite the right way. According to our experience, it is only after a long period of time and after we have really become one with the peasants and convinced them we are fighting in their interest that we can win victory. Don't imagine that the peasants will trust us right away. Don't expect them to trust us the moment we have given them some help.

The peasants are the chief ally of the proletariat. In the beginning our Party too did not realize the importance of work among the peasants and put urban work first and rural work second. It seems to me that the Parties in some Asian countries, such as India and Indonesia, have not done so well in rural work.

At first, our Party wasn't successful in its work among the peasants. The intellectuals had a certain air about them, an intellectual air. Therefore, they were unwilling to go to the countryside, which they looked down on. The peasants, for their part, looked askance at the intellectuals. Besides, our Party had not yet found the way to understand the countryside. Later when we went there again, we found the way, analysed the various classes in the rural areas and came to understand the peasants' revolutionary demands.

During the first period, we didn't have clear ideas about the countryside. Under the Right opportunist line of Chen Tu-hsiu, the peasants, our chief ally, were abandoned. Many of our comrades looked on the countryside as a plane rather than a solid, that is to say, they did not know how to look at the countryside from the class viewpoint. It was only after they had some grasp of Marxism that they began to adopt the class viewpoint in looking at the countryside. The countryside turned out to be not a plane, but stratified into the rich, the poor and the very poor, into farm labourers, poor peasants, middle peasants, rich peasants and landlords. During this period I made a study of the countryside and opened peasant movement institutes which ran for several terms. Though I knew some Marxism, my understanding of the countryside was not deep.

During the second period, we had to thank our good teacher, Chiang Kai-shek. He drove us to the countryside. This was a long period, a period of ten years of civil war, in which we fought against

him, and thus we were obliged to make a study of the countryside. In the first few years, our understanding of the countryside was still not so deep, but later it became better and deeper. During this period the three "Left" opportunist lines which were represented successively by Chu Chiu-pai, Li Li-san and Wang Ming caused great losses to our Party, and Wang Ming's "Left" opportunist line in particular brought about the collapse of most of our Party's rural base areas.

Then came the third period, the period of the War of Resistance Against Japan. When the Japanese imperialists invaded China, we stopped fighting the Kuomintang and fought Japanese imperialism instead. At that time our comrades could go openly to cities in Kuomintang areas. Wang Ming, who had previously made the mistake of pushing a "Left" opportunist line, now made the mistake of pushing a Right opportunist line. He had first carried out the ultra-Left policy of the Communist International, and this time he carried out an ultra-Right policy. He too was one of our good teachers by negative example and he educated our Party. We had another good teacher by negative example in Li Li-san. Their chief mistake at the time was dogmatism, transplanting foreign experience mechanically. Our Party liquidated their erroneous lines and really found the way to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete conditions of China. As a result, in the fourth period when Chiang Kai-shek launched an offensive against us, it was possible for us to overthrow him and found the People's Republic of China.

The experience of the Chinese revolution, that is, building rural base areas, encircling the cities from the countryside and finally seizing the cities, may not be wholly applicable to many of your countries, though it can serve for your reference. I beg to advise you not to transplant Chinese experience mechanically. The experience of any foreign country can serve only for reference and must not be regarded as dogma. The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete conditions of your own countries — the two must be integrated.

If you are to win over the peasants and rely on them, you must conduct investigations in the rural areas. The method is to investigate one or more villages and spend a few weeks there to get a clear idea of the class forces, the economic situation, living conditions and so on, in the countryside. The principal leaders, such as the general secretary of the Party, should themselves undertake this work and get to know one or two villages; they should try to find the time,

for it is well worth the effort. Though there are plenty of sparrows, it is not necessary to dissect every one of them; to dissect one or two is enough. When the general secretary of the Party has investigated one or two villages and knows what's what, he will be able to help his comrades to become acquainted with the villages and get a clear idea of the concrete conditions there. It seems to me that the general secretaries of the Parties in many countries don't attach importance to dissecting one or two "sparrows"; true, they know something about the countryside, but their knowledge doesn't go very deep, and therefore the directives they issue do not quite fit the rural conditions. Likewise, the comrades in charge of the leading bodies of the Party at the central, provincial and county levels should themselves investigate one or two villages, or dissect one or two "sparrows". This is called "anatomy".

There are two ways of making investigations, one is to look at flowers on horseback and the other is to get off your horse and look at them. If you look at flowers on horseback, you'll only get a superficial impression, as there are so many. In coming from Latin America to Asia you have been looking at flowers on horseback. There are so many flowers in your own countries that it's just not enough to give them a glance or two and then leave, and so the second way has to be adopted, that is, to get off your horse and look at the flowers, observe them closely and analyse one "flower", or dissect one "sparrow".

In countries under imperialist oppression there are two kinds of bourgeoisie — the national bourgeoisie and the comprador-bourgeoisie. Do these two kinds of bourgeoisie exist in your countries? Probably yes.

The comprador-bourgeoisie is always a running dog of imperialism and a target of the revolution. Different groups of the comprador-bourgeoisie belong to the monopoly capitalist groups of different imperialist countries such as the United States, Britain and France. In the struggle against the various comprador groups it is necessary to exploit the contradictions between imperialist countries, first coping with one of them and striking at the chief immediate enemy. For instance, in the past the Chinese comprador-bourgeoisie consisted of pro-British, pro-U.S. and pro-Japanese groups. During the War of Resistance Against Japan we exploited the contradiction between Britain and the United States on the one hand and Japan on the other, first striking down the Japanese aggressors and the comprador group depending on them. Then we turned round to deal blows at

the U.S. and British aggressor forces and bring down the pro-U.S. and pro-British comprador groups. The landlord class also consists of different factions. The most reactionary landlords are few in number, and those who are patriotic and favour fighting imperialism should not be lumped together with them when we strike. Moreover, a distinction must be made between the big and small landlords. Don't strike at too many enemies at a time, strike at a few, and even with the big landlords deal your blows only at the most reactionary handful. To strike at everyone may seem very revolutionary, but actually it causes great harm.

The national bourgeoisie is an opponent of ours. There is a popular saying in China, "Opponents always meet." One experience of the Chinese revolution is that caution is needed in dealing with the national bourgeoisie. While it is opposed to the working class, it is also opposed to imperialism. In view of the fact that our main task is to fight imperialism and feudalism and that the liberation of the people would be out of the question unless these two enemies are overthrown, we must by all means win the national bourgeoisie over to the fight against imperialism. The national bourgeoisie is not interested in fighting feudalism because it has close ties with the landlord class. What is more, it oppresses and exploits the workers. We must therefore struggle against it. But in order to win it over to join us in the fight against imperialism, we must know when to stop in the struggle, that is, the struggle must be waged on just grounds, to our advantage and with restraint. In other words, we must have just grounds for waging the struggle, be sure of victory, and use restraint when a proper measure of victory is gained. Hence the necessity of making investigations into the conditions of both sides, those of the workers and those of the capitalists. If we know only the workers and not the capitalists, we won't be able to hold talks with the latter. In this respect, it is also necessary to investigate typical cases, or to dissect one or two "sparrows"; both methods, looking at flowers on horseback and getting off your horse to look at them, should likewise be used.

Throughout the historical period of the struggle against imperialism and feudalism, we must win over and unite with the national bourgeoisie so that it will side with the people against imperialism. Even after the task of opposing imperialism and feudalism is in the main accomplished, we must still keep our alliance with the national bourgeoisie for a certain period. This will be advantageous in dealing with imperialist aggression, in expanding production and stabilizing

the market and also in winning over and remoulding bourgeois intellectuals.

You have not yet won state power but are preparing to seize it. Towards the national bourgeoisie a policy of "both unity and struggle" should be adopted. Unite with them in the common fight against imperialism and support all their anti-imperialist words and deeds, while waging an appropriate struggle against their reactionary, anti-working class and anti-Communist words and deeds. It is wrong to be one-sided; struggle without unity is a "Left" deviationist mistake and unity without struggle is a Right deviationist mistake. Both mistakes occurred in our Party and we learned bitter lessons from them. Later, we summed up the two kinds of experience and have since adopted a policy of "both unity and struggle", that is, to struggle whenever necessary and unite whenever possible. The aim of struggle is to unite with the national bourgeoisie and win victory in the struggle against imperialism.

In countries under the oppression of imperialism and feudalism the political party of the proletariat should raise the national banner and must have a programme of national unity by which to unite with all the forces that can be united, excluding the running dogs of imperialism. Let the whole nation see how patriotic the Communist Party is, how peace-loving and how desirous of national unity. This will help isolate imperialism and its running dogs, and the big landlord class and the big bourgeoisie too.

Communists should not be afraid of making mistakes. Mistakes have a dual character. On the one hand mistakes harm the Party and the people; on the other they serve as good teachers, giving both the Party and the people a good education, and this benefits the revolution. Failure is the mother of success. If there is nothing good about failure, how can it be the mother of success? When too many mistakes are made, there is bound to be a turn-about. That is Marxism. "Things turn into their opposites when they reach the extreme"; when mistakes pile up, light is not far off.

IN COMMEMORATION OF DR. SUN YAT-SEN

November 12, 1956

Let us pay tribute to our great revolutionary forerunner, Dr. Sun Yat-sen!

We pay tribute to him for the intense struggle he waged in the preparatory period of our democratic revolution against the Chinese reformists, taking the clear-cut stand of a Chinese revolutionary democrat. In this struggle he was the standard-bearer of China's revolutionary democrats.

We pay tribute to him for the signal contribution he made in the period of the Revolution of 1911 when he led the people in overthrowing the monarchy and founding the republic.

We pay tribute to him for his signal contribution in developing the new Three People's Principles from the old Three People's Principles in the first period of co-operation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party.

He bequeathed to us much that is useful in the sphere of political thought.

Save for a handful of reactionaries, the people of contemporary China are all successors in the revolutionary cause to which Dr. Sun Yat-sen dedicated himself.

We have completed the democratic revolution left unfinished by Dr. Sun Yat-sen and developed it into a socialist revolution. We are now in the midst of this revolution.

Things are always progressing. It is only forty-five years since the Revolution of 1911, but the face of China has entirely changed. In another forty-five years, that is, by the year 2001, at the beginning of the 21st century, China will have undergone an even greater change. It will have become a powerful industrial socialist country. And that is as it should be. China is a land with an area of 9,600,000 square

Article in commemoration of the ninetieth birthday of Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

kilometres and a population of 600 million, and it ought to make a greater contribution to humanity. But for a long time in the past its contribution was far too small. For this we are regretful.

However, we should be modest — not only now, but forty-five years hence and indeed always. In international relations, the Chinese people should rid themselves of great-nation chauvinism resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely.

Dr. Sun was a modest man. I heard him speak on many occasions and was impressed by the force of his character. From the way he applied himself to the study both of China's past and present and of foreign countries, including the Soviet Union, I knew he was a man with a receptive mind.

He worked heart and soul for the transformation of China, devoting his whole life to the cause; of him it can be justly said that he gave his best, gave his all, till his heart ceased to beat.

Like many great figures in history who stood in the forefront guiding the march of events, Dr. Sun, too, had his shortcomings. These shortcomings should be explained in the light of the historical conditions so that people can understand; we should not be too critical of our predecessors.

SPEECH AT THE SECOND PLENARY SESSION OF THE EIGHTH CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

November 15, 1956

I am going to speak on four questions: the economy, the international situation, Sino-Soviet relations and the question of great and small democracy.

I

We must make a comprehensive analysis of a problem before it can be properly solved. Whether to advance or to retreat, whether to get on or get off the horse, must accord with dialectics. In this world there are always cases of getting on or off the horse, of advancing or retreating. How is it possible to ride all day without getting off? When we walk, our two feet do not move forward together, but always one after the other. When we take a step, one foot moves forward, the other stays behind, and when we take the next, the latter moves forward, leaving the former behind. We see in a movie that the figures are continually in motion on the screen, but when we look at the film-strip, we see they are all motionless in each frame. The essay "Under Heaven" in *Chuang Tzu* says, "The shadow of a flying bird is not in motion." All things are at once in motion and not in motion — such is the dialectics of our world. Pure motionlessness does not exist, neither does pure motion. Motion is absolute while rest is temporary and conditional.

Our planned economy is at once in equilibrium and in disequilibrium. Equilibrium is temporary and conditional. After equilibrium is temporarily established, changes will take place. Equilibrium in the

first half of the year will become disequilibrium in the second half; equilibrium in the current year will change into disequilibrium in the next. It is impossible to have equilibrium all the time without having it upset. We Marxists hold that disequilibrium, contradiction, struggle and development are absolute, while equilibrium and rest are relative. Relative means temporary, conditional. Viewed in this light, is our economy advancing or retreating? We should tell the cadres and the masses that it is both advancing and retreating, but mainly advancing, though not in a straight line but in a wave-like manner. Although there are times when we get off the horse, as a rule we get on more often. Are our Party committees at all levels, the various central departments and the governments at all levels promoting progress or promoting retrogression? Fundamentally speaking, they are promoting progress. Society is always advancing, for to advance, to develop, is the general trend.

Is the First Five-Year Plan correct? I support the opinion that it is essentially correct, as is clearly shown by the first four years of its implementation. True, there have been mistakes, but this is hardly avoidable because we lack experience. Shall we still make mistakes in the future when we have gained experience after several five-year plans? Yes, we shall. One can never acquire enough experience. Will it be possible to make no mistakes at all in planning ten thousand years hence? Things happening ten thousand years hence will no longer be our business, but one thing is certain, mistakes will be made even then. Young people will make mistakes, but won't older people? Confucius said that at the age of seventy whatever he did was in conformity with objective law,¹ but I don't believe it, he was just bragging. Some of the construction projects above the norm in our First Five-Year Plan have been designed for us by the Soviet Union, but most of them have been of our own designing. Do you think the Chinese are incompetent? Why, we are competent too. However, it must be admitted that we are still not so competent, for we cannot as yet design some of the projects ourselves. There has been a problem in our construction in the last few years. As some comrades put it, attention has been paid only to the "bones" but very little to the "flesh". Factory buildings have been put up and machinery and other equipment installed without the municipal construction and service facilities to go with them, and this will become a big problem in the future. In my view, its effects will be felt not during the First Five-Year Plan, but during the Second, or perhaps the Third. As to whether

the First Five-Year Plan is correct, we can draw a partial conclusion now and another one next year, but I think a comprehensive conclusion will have to wait till the last phase of the Second Five-Year Plan. It is impossible to avoid some degree of subjectivism in planning. To make a few mistakes is not so bad. Achievements have a dual character and so have mistakes. Achievements encourage people but at the same time are liable to turn their heads; mistakes depress people and cause anxiety, hence they are an enemy, but at the same time a good teacher. On the whole, nothing seriously or fundamentally wrong has been found in the First Five-Year Plan so far.

We must protect the enthusiasm of the cadres and the masses and not pour cold water on them. Once some people did pour cold water on the socialist transformation of agriculture, and there was then, as it were, a "committee for promoting retrogression". We pointed out later that it was not right to pour cold water, so we countered with a committee for promoting progress. According to the original plan, the socialist transformation of ownership was to be basically completed in eighteen years, but with this promotion it has been greatly speeded up. The Draft Programme for Agricultural Development stipulates that higher-stage agricultural co-operation should be completed in 1958, and now it seems that we can achieve the aim this winter or next spring. There may be quite a few flaws in the process, but this is better than that committee for promoting retrogression; the peasants are pleased and there has been an increase in agricultural production. But for this co-operative transformation, the grain output could not have increased this year by over 20,000 million catties in the face of such severe natural calamities. In the stricken areas, the existence of co-operatives also helps relief work through production. The shortcomings of the cadres and the masses as well as our own are to be criticized on the premise that their enthusiasm is protected, and in this way they will have plenty of push. When the masses want something done which is impossible for the time being, matters should be clearly explained to them, and this can certainly be done.

There should be three rounds of discussion before the annual state budget is decided. That is to say, comrades on our Central Committee and other comrades concerned should hold three meetings to discuss it and make the decision. This will enable all of us to get to understand the contents of the budget. Otherwise it will always be the comrades in charge who know them better while we on our part will just raise our hands. Yet don't we know anything about the

contents? Well, I would say yes and no, we don't know very much about them. With this method of decision after three rounds of discussion, can you say you will know them very well? Not likely, and there will still be a gap between us and the comrades in charge. They are like opera singers on the stage, they know how to sing; we are like the audience, we don't know how to sing. But if we go to the opera often enough, we shall be able to tell good singers from poor ones more or less correctly. After all, it is up to the audience to pass judgment on the singer's performance. And it is with its help that the singer corrects his mistakes. This is where the audience is superior. An opera can continue to run if people like to see it over and over again. Operas which people don't like very much have to be changed. Therefore, inside our Central Committee there is the contradiction between experts and non-experts. Experts have their strong points, and so do non-experts. Non-experts can tell what is right from what is wrong.

In the report on the state budget for 1956 the expression "safely reliable" was used, and I suggest that from now on it should be changed into "fully reliable". At the meeting held last January on the question of the intellectuals, I used the expression "fully reliable". "Safe" and "reliable" are tautological. To use "safely" to modify "reliable" neither adds nor qualifies anything. A modifier both describes and qualifies. To say something is "fully reliable" is to qualify reliability as to degree, meaning that it is not just reliable in a general sense but reliable to the full. It is not easy to make things fully reliable. When the budget was adopted at the National People's Congress last June, everybody said it was reliable. Now it seems that a portion of the budget, less than 10 per cent, is unreliable, because some of the items are not given due priority and others are allocated too much money. So in the future we must pay attention to the priorities of the items in the budget. Whether the priorities are correct or not requires the experts' attention, but it also requires our attention, and particularly that of the comrades at the provincial level. Of course, everybody should give it his attention.

Both we and the secretaries of the provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees should attend to finance and planning. In the past some comrades failed to do so seriously. I would like to call your attention, comrades, to the questions of grain, pork, eggs, vegetables and so on, since they present quite a big problem. Beginning from last winter, efforts were concentrated on grain to the neglect of side-lines and industrial crops. This deviation has now been

corrected, and efforts have been shifted to them; particularly since there are fixed price ratios between grain and twenty or thirty other items such as cotton, edible oil, pigs and tobacco, the peasants have become very much interested in side-lines and industrial crops at the expense of grain. Lop-sided stress first on grain, and then on side-lines and industrial crops. Low prices for grain hurt the peasants; now that you have set such low prices for grain, the peasants will simply stop growing it. This problem merits close attention.

We must build the country through diligence and thrift, combat extravagance and waste, and encourage hard work and plain living and sharing weal and woe with the masses. Some comrades have suggested that factory directors and heads of schools and colleges might live in sheds, and this, I think, is a good idea, especially in hard times. There were no houses whatsoever when we crossed the marshlands on the Long March, we just slept where we could, and Commander-in-Chief Chu Teh did so too when he walked for forty days across the marshlands. We all came through. Our troops had no food and ate the bark and leaves of trees. To share happiness and suffering with the people — we did this in the past, why can't we do it now? As long as we keep on doing so, we shall not alienate ourselves from the masses.

We must attend to the newspapers. Where newspapers are published, the Central Committee and the Party committees at all levels should take the running of newspapers as a matter of major importance. Since the beginning of this year there has been one-sided and unrealistic propaganda in the press for improving the people's livelihood, but very little publicity has been given to building the country through diligence and thrift, combating extravagance and waste and encouraging hard work, plain living and sharing weal and woe with the masses, which should from now on be the focus of our propaganda in the press. Probably what is broadcast by the radio stations also comes from the newspapers. Therefore it is necessary to call meetings of reporters, newspaper staffs and radio personnel to exchange views with them and inform them of the guiding principles in our propaganda.

Here I would like to touch on another question, the question of suppressing counter-revolutionaries. Should the local tyrants and evil gentry, despots and counter-revolutionaries who have committed heinous crimes be put to death? Yes, they should. Some democratic personages say it is bad to execute them and we say it is fine —

we are singing different tunes, that's all. On this theme, we can never sing in tune with the democratic personages. Those we executed were "little Chiang Kai-sheks". As for the "big Chiang Kai-sheks" such as Emperor Pu Yi, Wang Yao-wu and Tu Yu-ming, we will execute none of them. But if the "little Chiang Kai-sheks" were not done away with, there would be an "earthquake" under our feet every day, the productive forces would not be set free nor the working people liberated. The productive forces consist of two factors, labourers and tools. If we did not suppress counter-revolutionaries, the working people would be unhappy. So would the oxen and the hoes, and even the land would feel uncomfortable, all because the peasants who put the oxen and hoes and the land to use would be unhappy. Therefore, some counter-revolutionaries must be executed, others arrested and still others put under public supervision.

II

On the whole, the international situation is fine. There are a few imperialist powers, but what of it? Nothing terrifying even if there were a few dozen more.

Now troubles have occurred in two areas, Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Disturbances have taken place in Poland and Hungary,² and Britain and France have launched an armed aggression against Egypt. I think these bad things are good things too. In the eyes of a Marxist, a bad thing has a dual character; on the one hand it is bad and on the other it is good. When people see the word "bad" before the word "thing", many think that it's nothing but bad. But we say there is another aspect to it, that is, a bad thing is at the same time a good thing, and this is what is meant by "failure is the mother of success". Every failure, every reverse, or every mistake, may lead to good results under given conditions. Since there is fire in Poland and Hungary, it will blaze up sooner or later. Which is better, to let the fire blaze, or not to let it? Fire cannot be wrapped up in paper. Now that fires have blazed up, that's just fine. In this way numerous counter-revolutionaries in Hungary have exposed themselves. The Hungarian incident has educated the Hungarian people and at the same time some comrades in the Soviet Union as well as us Chinese comrades. It was such a shock when Beria was uncovered. How

could a socialist country produce a Beria? It was another big shock when Kao Kang was exposed. It is precisely through such phenomena that we learn. They are in the nature of things and will always happen.

Will there still be revolutions in the future when all the imperialists in the world are overthrown and classes eliminated? What do you say? In my view, there will still be the need for revolution. The social system will still need to be changed and the term "revolution" will still be in use. Of course, revolutions then will not be of the same nature as those in the era of class struggle. But there will still be contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base. When the relations of production become unsuitable, they will have to be overthrown. If the superstructure (ideology and public opinion included) protects the kind of relations of production the people dislike, they will transform it. The superstructure itself constitutes social relations of another kind. It rests on the economic base. By the economic base we mean the relations of production, chiefly ownership. The productive forces are the most revolutionary factor. When the productive forces have developed, there is bound to be a revolution. The productive forces consist of two factors: one is man and the other tools. Tools are made by men. When tools call for a revolution, they will speak through men, through the labourers, who will destroy the old relations of production and the old social relations. "A gentleman uses his tongue, not his fists," and the best way is to reason things out. But if reasoning goes unheeded, arms will have to speak. What if there aren't any arms? The labourers have tools in their hands and those without can use rocks, and if there aren't any rocks even, there are always one's two fists.

Our state organs are organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Take the courts for instance, their function is to deal with counter-revolutionaries, but that is not all, for they have to settle numerous disputes among the people. It looks as if courts will still be needed ten thousand years from now. For when classes are eliminated, there will still be contradictions between the advanced and the backward, there will still be struggles and scuffles among people, and there will still be all sorts of disturbances. What a mess there would be without a court! However, the struggles will then be of a different nature, different from class struggle. The court will be different in nature too. The superstructure may then still go wrong. For instance, people like

us may make mistakes, lose out in struggle and be ousted from office, so that a Gomulka may come to power or a Jao Shu-shih be propped up. Would you say such things will not happen? I think they will, even a thousand or ten thousand years from now.

III

Everything in the world is a unity of opposites. By the unity of opposites we mean the unity of opposite things differing in nature. For instance, water is a combination of two elements, hydrogen and oxygen. If there were only hydrogen and no oxygen, or vice versa, water could not be formed. Over a million compounds are said to have already been named and no one knows how many have not yet been. All compounds are unities of opposites differing in nature. Likewise with things in society. The relationship between the central and the local authorities is a unity of opposites, and so is that between one department and another.

The relationship between two countries is also a unity of opposites. China and the Soviet Union are both socialist countries. Are there any differences between them? Yes, there are. The two countries are different in nationality. Thirty-nine years have gone by since the October Revolution took place, whereas it is only seven years since we won state power throughout the country. As for the things each has done, they are different in many ways. For instance, unlike theirs our agricultural collectivization has gone through several stages, our policy towards the capitalists is different from theirs, so are our market price policy and the way we handle the relationship between agriculture and light industry on the one hand and heavy industry on the other, and so are our army system and Party system. We have told them: We don't agree with some of the things you have done, nor do we approve of some of the ways you handle matters.

Some comrades simply don't pay attention to dialectics and are not analytical. They say all things Soviet are good and they transplant them mechanically. In fact, all things, whether Chinese or foreign, admit of analysis, some being good and some bad. This is true of the work in each province, there are both achievements and shortcomings. And it is also true of every one of us, for we all have not just one but

two aspects, strong points and weak points. The doctrine that everything has only one aspect has existed ever since ancient times, and so has the doctrine that everything has two aspects. They are known as metaphysics and dialectics respectively. An ancient Chinese said: "The *yin* and the *yang* make up the *Tao*."³ It is impossible to have only the *yin* without the *yang*, or vice versa. This was a doctrine in ancient times affirming two aspects. Metaphysics is a doctrine affirming only one aspect. And it still persists among a considerable number of comrades. They take a one-sided view of things and think everything Soviet is good and transplant it indiscriminately, bringing in quite a few things which should not have been transplanted. Where things are wrongly transplanted and unsuited to this land of ours, there must be changes.

Here I'll speak on the question of "having illicit relations with foreign countries". Are there such people in our country who provide foreigners with information behind the back of the Central Committee? I think there are. Kao Kang is a case in point. Many facts have proved this.

On December 24, 1953, at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee to unmask Kao Kang, I declared that there were two headquarters in the city of Peking, one comprised all of us present and it stirred up an open wind and lit an open fire, whereas the other was an underground headquarters, and it also stirred up a kind of wind and lit a kind of fire, a sinister wind and a sinister fire. Lin Tai-yu, a character in a classical Chinese novel, said: "Either the east wind prevails over the west wind, or the west wind prevails over the east wind." As for the present day, either the open wind and open fire prevail over the sinister wind and sinister fire, or the sinister wind and sinister fire prevail over the open wind and open fire. The purpose of the other headquarters in stirring up the sinister wind and lighting the sinister fire was to overpower the open wind and put out the open fire, that is, to overthrow a large number of people.

Among our cadres of higher and middle rank there are a few (not many) who maintain illicit relations with foreign countries. This is not good. I hope you comrades will make it clear to everybody in the leading Party groups and Party committees of the central departments as well as in the Party committees at the provincial, municipal and autonomous region level that this kind of business must stop. We don't

approve of some of the things done in the Soviet Union, and the Central Committee has already said this to the Soviet leaders several times; some questions on which we have not touched will be taken up later. If they are to be taken up, it should be done by the Central Committee. As for information, don't try to pass it on. Such information is of no use at all, it can only cause harm. It undermines the relations between the two Parties and the two countries. Moreover, those engaged in such activities put themselves in an awkward position. Since they do this behind the Party's back, they always have a guilty conscience. Those who have passed on information should make a clean breast of it and be done with it, or else there will be an investigation and they will be duly punished if found out.

I would like to say a few words about the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I think there are two "swords": one is Lenin and the other Stalin. The sword of Stalin has now been discarded by the Russians. Gomulka and some people in Hungary have picked it up to stab at the Soviet Union and oppose so-called Stalinism. The Communist Parties of many European countries are also criticizing the Soviet Union, and their leader is Togliatti. The imperialists also use this sword to slay people with. Dulles, for instance, has brandished it for some time. This sword has not been lent out, it has been thrown out. We Chinese have not thrown it away. First, we protect Stalin, and, second, we at the same time criticize his mistakes, and we have written the article "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". Unlike some people who have tried to defame and destroy Stalin, we are acting in accordance with objective reality.

As for the sword of Lenin, hasn't it too been discarded to a certain extent by some Soviet leaders? In my view, it has been discarded to a considerable extent. Is the October Revolution still valid? Can it still serve as the example for all countries? Khrushchov's report at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union says it is possible to seize state power by the parliamentary road, that is to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, by and large Leninism is thrown away.

The doctrine of Leninism has developed Marxism. In what respects has it done so? First, in world outlook, that is, in materialism and dialectics; and second, in revolutionary theory and tactics, particularly

on the questions of class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the political party of the proletariat. And then there are Lenin's teachings on socialist construction. Beginning from the October Revolution of 1917, construction went on in the midst of revolution, and thus Lenin had seven years of practical experience in construction, something denied to Marx. It is precisely these fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism that we have been learning.

In both our democratic revolution and our socialist revolution, we have mobilized the masses to wage class struggle in the course of which we have educated the people. It is from the October Revolution that we have learned to wage class struggle. During the October Revolution, the masses in the cities and villages were fully mobilized to wage class struggle. Those who are now sent by the Soviet Union as experts to various countries were but children or teenagers at the time of the October Revolution, and many of them have forgotten about this practice. Comrades in some countries say that China's mass line is not right, and they are only too happy to pick up the paternalistic approach. There is no stopping them if they want to do so; in any case, we adhere to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, with non-interference in each other's internal affairs and mutual non-aggression. We have no intention of exercising leadership over any country save our own, that is, the People's Republic of China.

The fundamental problem with some East European countries is that they have not done a good job of waging class struggle and have left so many counter-revolutionaries at large; nor have they trained their proletariat in class struggle to help them learn how to draw a clear distinction between the people and the enemy, between right and wrong and between materialism and idealism. And now they have to reap what they have sown, they have brought the fire upon their own heads.

How much capital do you have? Just Lenin and Stalin. Now you have abandoned Stalin and practically all of Lenin as well, with Lenin's feet gone, or perhaps with only his head left, or with one of his hands cut off. We, on our part, stick to studying Marxism-Leninism and learning from the October Revolution. Marx has left us a great many writings, and so has Lenin. To rely on the masses, to follow the mass line — this is what we have learned from them. Not to rely on the masses in waging class struggle and not to make a clear distinction between the people and the enemy — that would be very dangerous.

IV

A few cadres with an intellectual background at the level of department or bureau head advocate great democracy, saying that small democracy is not satisfying enough. Their "great democracy" means the adoption of the bourgeois parliamentary system of the West and the imitation of such Western stuff as "parliamentary democracy", "freedom of the press" and "freedom of speech". Their advocacy is wrong, for they lack the Marxist viewpoint, the class viewpoint. However, the terms great democracy and small democracy are quite graphic, so we have borrowed them.

Democracy is a method, and it all depends on to whom it is applied and for what purpose. We are in favour of great democracy. And what we favour is great democracy under the leadership of the proletariat. We mobilized the masses to fight Chiang Kai-shek and licked him after a struggle lasting more than twenty years. In the agrarian reform movement, the peasant masses rose against the landlord class and got land after three years of struggle. These were instances of great democracy. The movement against the "three evils" was a struggle against those of our personnel who had been corrupted by the bourgeoisie. The movement against the "five evils" was a struggle against the bourgeoisie. In both movements relentless blows were dealt. These were all vigorous mass movements and instances of great democracy. A few days ago, masses of people held a demonstration in front of the Office of the British Chargé d'Affaires in China, and several hundred thousand people held a rally at Tien An Men Square in Peking in support of Egypt's resistance to Anglo-French aggression. This was also an instance of great democracy, aimed at imperialism. Why shouldn't we cherish this great democracy? We do in fact cherish it. Who is this great democracy directed against? Against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, and against capitalism. The socialist transformation of private industry and commerce was directed against capitalism. The socialist transformation of agriculture, which was designed to abolish the private ownership of small producers, was by its nature also directed against capitalism. It was by means of the mass movement that we carried out the socialist transformation of agriculture, mobilizing the peasants, principally the poor and lower-middle peasants first, to organize themselves, so that the upper-middle peasants could not but agree. As for the fact that the capitalists beat drums and

struck gongs to welcome the socialist transformation, it was because they had no alternative with the advent of the socialist upsurge in the countryside and with the pressure from the masses of workers under them.

If great democracy is now to be practised again, I am for it. You are afraid of the masses taking to the streets, I am not, not even if hundreds of thousands should do so. "He who is not afraid of death by a thousand cuts dares to unhorse the emperor." This was a saying of a character in a classical Chinese novel, Wang Hsi-feng, otherwise called Sister Feng. She it was who said this. The great democracy set in motion by the proletariat is directed against class enemies. Enemies of the nation (who are none other than the imperialists and the foreign monopoly capitalists) are class enemies also. Great democracy can be directed against bureaucrats too. I just said that there would still be revolutions ten thousand years from now, so possibly great democracy will have to be practised then. If some people grow tired of life and so become bureaucratic, if, when meeting the masses, they have not a single kind word for them but only take them to task, and if they don't bother to solve any of the problems the masses may have, they are destined to be overthrown. Now this danger does exist. If you alienate yourself from the masses and fail to solve their problems, the peasants will wield their carrying-poles, the workers will demonstrate in the streets and the students will create disturbances. Whenever such things happen, they must in the first place be taken as good things, and that is how I look at the matter.

Several years ago, an airfield was to be built somewhere in Honan Province, but no proper arrangements were made beforehand for the peasants living there nor any adequate explanations offered them when they were compelled to move out. The peasants of the village affected said, even the birds will make a few squawks if you go poking with your pole at their nest in a tree and try to bring it down. Teng Hsiao-ping, you, too, have a nest, and if I destroyed it, wouldn't you make a few squawks? So the local people set up three lines of defence: the first line was composed of children, the second of women, and the third of able-bodied young men. All who went there to do the surveying were driven away and the peasants won out in the end. Later, when satisfactory explanations were given and arrangements made, they agreed to move and the airfield was built. There are quite a few similar cases. Now there are people who seem to think that, as state power has been won, they can sleep soundly without any worry and play the tyrant

at will. The masses will oppose such persons, throw stones at them and strike at them with their hoes, which will, I think, serve them right and will please me immensely. Moreover, sometimes to fight is the only way to solve a problem. The Communist Party needs to learn a lesson. Whenever students and workers take to the streets, you comrades should regard it as a good thing. There were over a hundred students from Chengtu who wanted to come to Peking to present a petition, but those in one train were halted at the Kuangyuan station in Szechuan Province, while those in another train got as far as Loyang but failed to reach Peking. It is my opinion and Premier Chou's too that the students should have been allowed to come to Peking and call on the departments concerned. The workers should be allowed to go on strike and the masses to hold demonstrations. Processions and demonstrations are provided for in our Constitution. In the future when the Constitution is revised, I suggest that the freedom to strike be added, so that the workers shall be allowed to go on strike. This will help resolve the contradictions between the state and the factory director on the one hand and the masses of workers on the other. After all they are nothing but contradictions. The world is full of contradictions. The democratic revolution resolved the set of contradictions with imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism. At present, when the contradictions with national capitalism and small production with respect to ownership have been basically resolved, contradictions in other respects have come to the fore, and new contradictions have arisen. There are several hundred thousand cadres at the level of the county Party committee and above who hold the destiny of the country in their hands. If they fail to do a good job, alienate themselves from the masses and do not live plainly and work hard, the workers, peasants and students will have good reason to disapprove of them. We must watch out lest we foster the bureaucratic style of work and grow into an aristocratic stratum divorced from the people. The masses will have good reason to remove from office whoever practises bureaucracy, makes no effort to solve their problems, scolds them, tyrannizes over them and never tries to make amends. I say it is fine to remove such fellows, and they ought to be removed.

Now the democratic parties and the bourgeoisie are against the great democracy of the proletariat. If we were to start a second movement against the "five evils", they would not like it. They are very much afraid that the democratic parties will be eliminated and will not enjoy long-term coexistence if great democracy is put into

practice. Do professors like great democracy? It is hard to say, but I think they are on their guard, they too are afraid of proletarian great democracy. If they want to practise bourgeois great democracy, I will propose a rectification, that is, ideological remoulding. All the students will be mobilized to criticize them, and in every college a checkpoint, so to speak, will be set up which they must pass through before the whole matter can be considered closed. So professors, too, are afraid of proletarian great democracy.

Here I will take up another topic, the question of the Dalai. Buddha has been dead for 2,500 years, and now the Dalai and his followers want to go to India and pay homage to him. Shall we let him go or not? The Central Committee thinks that it is better to let him go than not. He will set out in a few days. We advised him to go by air, but he refused, preferring to travel by car via Kalimpong,⁴ where there are spies from various countries as well as Kuomintang secret agents. It must be anticipated that the Dalai may not come back, that, in addition, he may abuse us every day, making allegations such as “the Communists have invaded Tibet”, and that he may go so far as to declare “the independence of Tibet” in India. It must also be anticipated that he may incite the Tibetan upper-stratum reactionaries to issue a call for major disturbances in the hope of driving us out, while using his absence as an alibi to shirk responsibility. This is possible, if the worst comes to the worst. I would still be glad even if this bad situation occurred. Our Working Committee and our troops in Tibet must make preparations, build fortifications and store up plenty of food and water. All we have there is only a few soldiers; anyway, each party is free to act as he chooses. If you want to fight, we shall be on our guard; if you make an attack, we shall defend ourselves. We should never attack first but let them do so, and then we shall launch a counter-attack and crush the attackers with relentless blows. Shall I feel aggrieved at the desertion of one Dalai? Not at all, even if you throw in nine more and make it ten Dalais. It was our experience that Chang Kuo-tao’s desertion did not turn out to be a bad thing. You cannot bind a man and a woman together to make them husband and wife. When someone stops caring for your place and wants to leave it, just let him go. What harm will his departure do us? None whatsoever. He can’t do more than curse us. Our Communist Party has been cursed for thirty-five years. And the curses have been just such hackneyed nonsense as that the Communist Party “is extremely ferocious”, “communizes property and women” and “is

brutal and inhuman". What difference will it make if a Dalai or anyone else should be added to the number of abusers? If the abusing goes on for another thirty-five years, that will amount to only seventy years. I don't consider it good for a person to be afraid of being abused. Some people are worried that confidential information may be divulged. Didn't Chang Kuo-tao possess a lot of confidential information? Never heard that our affairs went amiss as a result of Chang Kuo-tao divulging confidential information.

Our Party has millions of experienced cadres. Most of them are good cadres, born and brought up on our native soil, linked to the masses and tested in the course of long struggles. We have a whole body of cadres — those who joined the revolution in the period of the founding of the Party, in the period of the Northern Expedition, during the War of the Agrarian Revolution, the War of Resistance Against Japan, and the War of Liberation and those who joined after nationwide liberation. They are all valuable assets to our country. The situation in some East European countries is not very stable, and one major reason is that they lack such a body of experienced cadres. With such cadres as ours who have been tested in different periods of the revolution, we are able to "sit tight in the fishing boat despite the rising wind and waves". We must have this much confidence. We are not even afraid of imperialism, so why should we be afraid of great democracy? Why should we be afraid of students taking to the streets? Yet among our Party members there are some who are afraid of great democracy, and this is not good. Those bureaucrats who are afraid of great democracy must study Marxism hard and mend their ways.

We are to carry out a rectification movement next year. Three bad styles are to be rectified: (1) subjectivism, (2) sectarianism and (3) bureaucracy. After the Central Committee has made the decision, a circular will first be issued, in which different items will be listed. For instance, bureaucracy consists of several items, such as failure to make contact with cadres and the masses, failure to go down and find out about the situation below and failure to share weal and woe with the masses, plus corruption, waste and so on. If a circular is issued in the first half of the year, the rectification movement is to begin in the second, with a period of several months in between. Whoever has embezzled public money must confess and return it during that interval, or pay it back later in instalments, or if he cannot possibly manage it even in instalments, he will have to be exempted from repaying it; each of these three ways is all right. But in any case he must admit his

mistake and of his own accord state the amount taken. This is to provide him, so to speak, with a staircase by which he can come down step by step. This method is also to be adopted in dealing with other mistakes. Rather than meting out “punishment without prior warning”, make an announcement beforehand and then start the rectification movement at the specified time — this is a method of applying small democracy. Some say, if this method is adopted, there probably won’t be much left to rectify in the second half of the year. That is precisely the end we hope to achieve. Our hope is that by the time the rectification movement formally starts, subjectivism, sectarianism and bureaucracy will have been considerably reduced. In our history the rectification movement has proved to be an effective method. From now on, all problems among the people or inside the Party are to be solved by means of rectification, by means of criticism and self-criticism, and not by force. We are in favour of the method of the “gentle breeze and mild rain”, and though it is hardly avoidable that in a few cases things may get a little too rough, the over-all intention is to cure the sickness and save the patient, and truly to achieve this end instead of merely paying lip-service to it. The first principle is to protect a person, and the second one is to criticize him. First he is to be protected because he is not a counter-revolutionary. This means to start from the desire for unity and, through criticism and self-criticism, arrive at a new unity on a new basis. Within the ranks of the people, if we adopt the method of both protecting and criticizing a person who has made mistakes, we shall win people’s hearts, be able to unite the entire people and bring into play all the positive factors among our 600 million people for building socialism.

I am in favour of the idea that in peace-time the wage gap between cadres in the army and those outside it should be gradually narrowed, but this does not mean absolute egalitarianism. I have always been of the opinion that the army should live plainly and work hard and be a model. At a meeting held here in 1949, one of our generals proposed that the pay in the army should be raised, and many comrades were for his proposal, but I was against it. The illustration he used was that a capitalist ate a meal of five courses whereas a PLA soldier had only salt water plus some pickled cabbage at a meal, and this, he said, wouldn’t do. I said, on the contrary, this was just fine. They had five courses while we ate pickles. There was politics in these pickles, out of which models would emerge. The PLA won people’s hearts precisely because of these pickles, but, of course, there were other factors too.

Now the army meals have improved and are already rather different from having only pickles to eat. But what is most essential is that we must advocate plain living and hard work, which is our intrinsic political quality. Chinchow is an apple-growing area. At the time of the Liaohsi campaign, it was autumn, and there were plenty of apples in the villagers' homes, but our fighters did not take a single apple. I was deeply moved when I read about this. Here the fighters themselves were conscious that not to eat the apples was noble, whereas to eat them would have been ignoble, for the apples belonged to the people. Our discipline rests on such consciousness. It is the result of leadership and education by our Party. Man must have some spirit, and the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat stems from this consciousness. Did anyone starve to death from not eating an apple? No, for there was millet plus pickles. In times of necessity, you comrades present here will have to live in sheds. When we crossed the marshlands, we had no sheds to sleep in and yet we managed without. Why can't we live in sheds now that we have them? The army people have been in session these few days, and they have expressed with deep feelings and enthusiasm their readiness to exercise self-denial and practise economy. Now that the army is doing this, there is all the more reason for other people to live plainly and work hard. Otherwise they would be challenged by the army people. There are both civilians and army people present here, so we'll let the army people challenge the civilians. The PLA is a good army, and I like it very much.

Political work must be strengthened. It must be greatly strengthened in every sphere, whether among civilians or army people, whether in factories, villages, shops, schools or army units, whether in Party and government organs or people's organizations, so as to raise the political level of the cadres and the masses.

NOTES

¹ This refers to a saying of Confucius, "At seventy, I can follow my heart's desire, without transgressing what is right." *Confucian Analects*, Book II, "Wei Cheng".

² They refer to the riot that occurred in Poznan, Poland, in June 1956 and to the counter-revolutionary rebellion that took place in Hungary in October of the same year.

³ *The Book of Changes*, "Hsi Tzu", Part I.

⁴ Kalimpong is a border town in northeastern India near Yatung in Tibet, China.

TALKS AT A CONFERENCE OF SECRETARIES OF PROVINCIAL, MUNICIPAL AND AUTONOMOUS REGION PARTY COMMITTEES

January 1957

I. THE TALK OF JANUARY 18

The present conference will chiefly discuss three questions: the question of ideological trends, the rural question and the economic question. Today I shall speak on the question of ideological trends.

We should keep tabs on ideological trends, which I am taking up here as the first question. At present, certain problems concerning them inside the Party and in society at large have cropped up and demand our close attention.

One kind of problem arises among our own ranks. For example, some cadres now scramble for fame and fortune and are interested only in personal gain. In the discussion of the grading of cadres, there were instances where a cadre would not be satisfied with a rise of one grade, even a rise of two grades still left him weeping in bed, and perhaps only a three-grade promotion could get him out of bed. The fuss they kicked up has settled the question. This business of grading cadres, have done with it! Let wages be roughly evened out, with slight differences here and there. In the old days, the government of the Northern warlords had a prime minister by the name of Tang Shao-yi. Years later he was magistrate of Chungshan County, Kwangtung Province. If a prime minister in the old society could serve as a county magistrate, why on earth can't our government ministers do likewise? In this regard, those who fuss over their rank and can be graded up but not down compare poorly, in my opinion, with this old mandarin. They vie with each other not in plain living, doing more work and having fewer comforts, but for luxuries, rank and status. At present,

this kind of thinking has grown considerably in the Party, and the matter demands our attention.

Is agricultural co-operation promising, or is it unpromising? Which is better, the co-operative, or the individual economy? This question has been raised again. Last year, it did not come up in places reaping a rich harvest or in areas stricken by serious natural adversities, but only in those co-operatives which had suffered natural adversities but not of a serious kind or reaped a harvest but not a rich one. The cash value of work-points in these co-operatives turned out to be less than had been promised, and there was no increase but actually a decrease in the income of the members. This gave rise to such talk as, "Is the co-operative still good and worth preserving?" And this kind of talk has found an echo among certain Party cadres. The co-operatives, some say, are in no way superior. Some government ministers made a brief visit to the countryside, and on their return to Peking they spread alarmist views, saying that the peasants were listless and not keen on farming, as if the co-operatives were on the verge of collapse and extinction. Some co-operative directors cannot hold their heads up because they are being attacked right and left and have to endure criticisms from above and from the press. Some heads of the propaganda departments of Party committees shy away from making propaganda about the superiority of the co-operatives. Minister of Agriculture Liao Lu-yen, who is concurrently Deputy Director of the Rural Work Department of the Party Central Committee, says in effect that he himself feels discouraged and so do the responsible cadres under him, and that the co-operatives won't work anyway and the forty-article Programme for Agricultural Development is no longer valid. What are we to do with a person who feels discouraged? That's simple. If someone is losing courage, we just pump a little into him. The newspapers have now taken on a different tone in their propaganda, dwelling on the superiority of the co-operatives and speaking well rather than ill of them. Keep this up for several months to generate a little courage.

The year before last there was a struggle against a Right deviation, and last year a struggle against "rash advance", which resulted in another Right deviation. By this I mean the Right deviation on the question of socialist revolution, primarily that of socialist transformation in the rural areas. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that a gust of wind with the force of a typhoon has been blowing among our cadres. A considerable number of our ministers, vice-ministers, heads of

departments or bureaus as well as cadres at the provincial level are from landlord, rich peasant or well-to-do middle peasant families, and in some cases their fathers are landlords who to this day are deprived of the right to vote. When these cadres go home for a visit, they hear from their folks nothing but adverse comments such as that the co-operatives are no good and won't last. The well-to-do middle peasants are a wavering social stratum, the go-it-alone tendency among them is rising again, and some want to withdraw from the co-operatives. The wind blowing among our cadres indicates what is in the minds of these classes and strata.

Agricultural co-operation is sure to be a success, but it cannot achieve complete success in a year or two. This must be made clear to comrades in the Party, the government, the army and the people's organizations. The co-operatives have only a short history, mostly of a year or a year and a half, and are lacking in experience. People who have been working for the revolution most of their lives still make mistakes, so how can you expect those who have been at the job for only a year to a year and a half to make no mistakes at all? To say that co-operation won't work when there is a little wind and rain is itself a big mistake. In point of fact, most co-operatives are doing well or fairly well. Cite just one co-operative that is being managed successfully, and you will be able to explode all the absurd arguments against co-operation. If this co-operative can be run well, why can't others? If this co-operative displays superiority, why can't others? Publicize the experience of this co-operative wherever you go. Each province should be able to find at least one such example. Choose a co-operative with the worst conditions including an unfavourable terrain, which previously had very low yields and was very poor. Do not choose one where the conditions were good to start with. Of course, it is fine if you have scores of examples, but if you can make just one co-operative work well, that spells success.

There is also trouble in the schools and colleges, and in a number of places students have created disturbances. In Shihchiachuang jobs were temporarily not available for some students of the graduating class in a school, and they had to stay on another year. This aroused their discontent. A handful of counter-revolutionaries seized the opportunity to agitate, organize a demonstration and threaten to occupy the Shihchiachuang radio station and proclaim a "Hungary". They put up many posters, the most striking of which carried these three slogans: "Down with fascism!" "We want war, not peace!" and "Socialism

is in no way superior!” According to them, the Communist Party was fascist and people like us had to be overthrown. The slogans they put up were so reactionary that they estranged the workers, peasants and people in all walks of life. In Peking a student of Tsinghua University openly declared, “The day will come when I will have thousands and tens of thousands of people shot!” With the introduction of the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend, even this “school” has come into the open. Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping went to the university and made a speech. If you want to have thousands and tens of thousands of people shot, he said, then we will have to enforce dictatorship.

According to a survey made in Peking, most college students are children of landlords, rich peasants, the bourgeoisie and well-to-do middle peasants, while students from working-class and poor and lower-middle peasant families account for less than 20 per cent. Probably this is roughly the case too in the rest of the country. This situation should change, but it will take time. Gomulka has been very popular with a number of our college students, and so have Tito and Kardelj. On the other hand, at the time of the riots in Poland and Hungary, most of the landlords and rich peasants in the countryside and the capitalists and members of the democratic parties in the cities behaved better and made no attempt to stir up trouble or come out with threats to kill thousands and tens of thousands of people. But one should be analytical about their behaviour. For they no longer have any political capital, the workers and the poor and lower-middle peasants won't listen to them, and they have no ground to stand on. Should something happen like atom bombs blowing up Peking and Shanghai, wouldn't these people change? You can't be too sure they wouldn't. In that eventuality, there would be a process of realignment of the landlords, the rich peasants, the bourgeoisie and the members of the democratic parties. They have worldly wisdom, and many of them are lying low. Their offspring — those school kids — are inexperienced, and it is they who expose such wares as “I will have thousands and tens of thousands of people shot” and “Socialism is in no way superior”.

There is queer talk among some professors too, such as that the Communist Party should be done away with, the Communist Party cannot lead them, socialism is no good, and so on and so forth. Before, they kept these ideas to themselves, but since the policy of letting a hundred schools of thought contend gave them an opportunity to speak up, these remarks have come tumbling out. Have you seen the film *The*

Life of Wu Hsun? There is one shot of a writing brush, dozens of feet long, symbolizing the “men of learning”. A sweep of that brush could be terrific. Now they are coming out, probably with the intention of sweeping us away. Aren’t they in fact attempting a restoration?

During the past year, several storms raged on the world scene. At the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union they went for Stalin in a big way. Subsequently the imperialists stirred up two storms against communism, and there were two stormy debates in the international communist movement. Amidst these storms, the impact and losses were quite big in the case of some Communist Parties in Europe and the Americas but smaller for the Communist Parties in the Orient. With the convocation of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, some people who had been most enthusiastic for Stalin became most vehement against him. In my view, these people do not adhere to Marxism-Leninism, they do not take an analytical approach to things and they lack revolutionary morality. Marxism-Leninism embraces the revolutionary morality of the proletariat. Since formerly you were all for Stalin, you should at least give some reason for making such a sharp turn. But you offer no reason at all for this sudden about-face, as if you had never in your life supported Stalin, though in fact you had fully supported him before. The question of Stalin concerns the entire international communist movement and involves the Communist Parties of all countries.

Most cadres in our Party are dissatisfied with the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and think it went too far in attacking Stalin. That is a normal feeling and a normal reaction. But a few cadres started to vacillate. Before it rains in a typhoon, ants come out of their holes, they have very sensitive “noses” and they know their meteorology. No sooner had the typhoon of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU struck than a few such ants in China came out of their holes. They are wavering elements in the Party who vacillate whenever something is astir. When they heard of the sweeping denunciation of Stalin, they felt good and swung to the other side, cheering and saying that Khrushchov was right in everything and that they themselves had been of the same opinion all along. Later when the imperialists struck a few blows and a few more came from inside the international communist movement, even Khrushchov had to change his tune somewhat, and so they swung back to this side again. In the face of an irresistible trend, they had no choice but to swing back. A tuft of grass atop the wall sways right and left in the wind. The waverers’ real intention was not to

swinging to our side, but to the other. It's a good thing that some people inside and outside the Party sang the praises of the Polish and Hungarian incidents. They could not open their mouths without talking about Poznan and Hungary. In so doing they gave themselves away. Ants came out of their holes and turtles, tortoises and all the scum of the earth left their hiding places. They danced to Gomulka's baton. When Gomulka talked about great democracy, they echoed him. Now the situation has changed and they are keeping their mouths shut. But that's not what they really want to do. Their real desire is to speak out.

When a typhoon strikes, the wavering elements who cannot withstand it begin to vacillate. That's a law. I would like to call your attention to it. Some people, having vacillated a few times, gain experience and stop wavering. But there is a type of person who will go on wavering forever. They are like some crops, rice for example, which sway at a whiff of wind because of their slender stalks. Sorghum and maize with their stouter stalks do better. Only big trees stand upright and rock-firm. Typhoons occur every year. So do ideological and political typhoons at home and abroad. This is a natural phenomenon in society. A political party is a kind of society, a political kind of society. The primary category in political society consists of political parties and political groups. A political party is a class organization. Our Chinese Communist Party is a proletarian political party composed chiefly of people of working-class and semi-proletarian poor peasant origin. But there are also a number of Party members who hail from landlord, rich peasant and capitalist families, or have a well-to-do middle peasant or urban petty-bourgeois origin. Though more or less tempered in long years of arduous struggle, quite a number have not acquired much Marxism, and thus ideologically or mentally they are apt to sway in the wind like rice stalks.

Some Party members who have come through many tests now find it difficult to pass the test of socialism. Hsueh Hsun is a typical example. She was formerly a deputy secretary of the Hopei Provincial Party Committee and a vice-governor of the province. When did she begin to vacillate? At the time when the state monopoly of the purchase and marketing of grain was first instituted. It was an important measure for implementing socialism. But she was dead against it and opposed it at all costs. Another example is Meng Yung-chien, deputy director of the All-China Federation of Supply and Marketing Co-operatives. In a letter of petition he, too, firmly opposed this state

monopoly. When agricultural co-operation was being carried out, again some people in the Party opposed it. In short, there are high-ranking Party cadres who have vacillated and cannot pass the test of socialism. Has this state of affairs come to an end? No, it hasn't. Will these people become firm and really believe in socialism ten years from now? Well, not necessarily. Ten years from now, when something crops up, they may say again, I foresaw that long ago.

Here is some material to be distributed among the comrades present which shows the ideological trends among certain cadres in the army. Although there is something valid in their opinions, for instance, when they say the wages of some cadres are too high and the peasants don't like it, the general tenor is not quite right and the fundamental line they follow is wrong. They criticize our Party's policies as being "Left" in the countryside and Right in the cities. For all its 9,600,000 square kilometres China is made up of but two constituents, town and country. According to them, we are wrong in both.

When they say our rural policy has deviated to the "Left", they mean that the income of the peasants is meagre, less than that of the workers. Here one should make an analysis and not judge by income alone. It is true that the income of the workers is generally higher than that of the peasants, but the value they produce is bigger, and besides they have to pay more for daily necessities. The improvement of the peasants' livelihood depends mainly on their own efforts to increase production. The government is also doing much to help them, building water conservancy projects, granting them agricultural credits, and so on. Our tax on agricultural products, side-line products included, forms about 8 per cent of the total value of the peasants' output, and no tax is levied on many side-lines. The state purchases grain at standard prices. Moreover, the state gets only a very small profit from the exchange of industrial products for the peasants' agricultural products. We do not adopt the system of obligatory sales enforced in the Soviet Union. In the exchange of industrial products for agricultural products, we try to narrow the price scissors instead of widening them as in the Soviet Union. There is a world of difference between our policy and that of the Soviet Union. Therefore, our rural policy cannot be said to have deviated to the "Left".

Some of the ranking cadres in our army make complaints on behalf of the peasants because they are affected by the remarks of well-to-do middle peasants, rich peasants or landlords which they may have heard on visits to their home town or from relatives invited to stay

with them. In the first half of 1955 a good many Party members made such complaints, chiming in with Liang Shu-ming and his ilk, as if only people from these two quarters spoke for the peasants and understood their sufferings. In their eyes, our Central Committee does not represent the peasants, nor do the provincial Party committees and the majority of Party members. A survey in Kiangsu Province shows that in some places 30 per cent of the cadres at the county, district and township levels made complaints on behalf of the peasants. It further reveals that most of them belong to rather well-to-do families which have surplus grain for sale. What they call "sufferings" turns out to be having surplus grain. And when they say "help the peasants" and "show concern for the peasants", they mean withholding sales of surplus grain to the state. Who on earth do these grumblers represent? Not the peasant masses, but a small number of well-to-do peasants.

As for the charge that our urban policy has deviated to the Right, this seems to be the case, as we have undertaken to provide for the capitalists and pay them a fixed rate of interest for a period of seven years.¹ What is to be done after the seven years? That is to be decided according to the circumstances prevailing then. It is better to leave the matter open, that is, to go on giving them a certain amount in fixed interest. At this small cost we are buying over this class. The Central Committee has given this policy very careful consideration. On the whole, the capitalists plus the democrats and intellectuals associated with them have a higher level of cultural and technical knowledge. By buying over this class, we have deprived them of their political capital and kept their mouths shut. The way to deprive them is to buy them over and make arrangements to give them jobs. Thus political capital will not be in their hands but in ours. We must deprive them of every bit of their political capital and continue to do so until not one jot is left to them. Therefore, neither can our urban policy be said to have deviated to the Right.

Our rural policy is correct and so is our urban policy. That is why a nation-wide disturbance such as the Hungarian incident cannot take place here. At most a small number of people may create trouble here and there and clamour for so-called great democracy. There is nothing terrifying about great democracy. On this score I do not see eye to eye with some comrades among you, who seem scared of it. In my view, should great democracy come about, first, you should not be scared of it and, second, you should make an analysis of the words and deeds of its advocates. In pushing their so-called great democracy,

those bad types are bound to say or do something wrong, which will only expose and isolate them. To “have thousands and tens of thousands of people shot” — is this the way to resolve contradictions among the people? Can this win any sympathy from the majority of people? “Down with fascism” and “Socialism is in no way superior” — doesn’t this flagrantly violate the Constitution? The Communist Party and the state power under its leadership are revolutionary and socialism is superior; this is all stated in the Constitution and acknowledged by the whole nation. “We want war, not peace” — well, that’s fine! So you are calling for war, and yet what you can muster is only a small band, an insufficient number of men without trained officers. These kids have really gone mad! That school in Shih-chiachuang had a discussion on the three slogans mentioned above and out of seventy representatives only a dozen spoke in favour, while fifty-odd said no. Then the slogans were discussed among four thousand students. Not a single one approved, so the dozen were isolated. The ultra-reactionaries who put up and stuck to these slogans were only a handful. If they had not taken up great democracy and splashed those posters everywhere, we would have been in the dark as to what they were up to. Once they pressed for great democracy, they got caught. One good thing about the Hungarian incident was that these ants in China were thus lured out of their holes.

In Hungary, great democracy toppled the Party, the government and the army once it was set in motion. This will not happen in China. If a handful of school kids can topple our Party, government and army by a show of force, we must all be fatheads. Therefore, don’t be afraid of great democracy. If there is a disturbance, it will help get the festering sore cured, and that’s a good thing. We were not afraid of imperialism in the past nor are we now. And we have never been afraid of Chiang Kai-shek. Are we now to be afraid of great democracy? I say we ought not to be. If anyone resorts to what he calls great democracy to oppose the socialist system and try to overthrow the leadership of the Communist Party, we shall exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat over him.

On the question of the intellectuals, there is a tendency today to stress arranging jobs for them to the neglect of remoulding them, there is too much of the former and too little of the latter. With the introduction of the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend, there has been some timidity about remoulding intellectuals. Since we have not been timid about

remoulding capitalists, why should we be timid about remoulding intellectuals and democratic personages?

Let a hundred flowers blossom — I think we should go on doing that. Some comrades hold that only fragrant flowers should be allowed to blossom and that poisonous weeds should not be allowed to grow. This approach shows little understanding of the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend. In general, counter-revolutionary statements will naturally be prohibited. However, if they are made not in a counter-revolutionary form but in a revolutionary guise, you will have to allow them. That will help us see these statements for what they are and wage struggles against them. Two kinds of plants grow in the fields, grain and weeds. Weeding must be done every year, indeed several times a year. If you say you will allow only fragrant flowers to blossom and no poisonous weeds to grow, that is tantamount to saying that you will allow only grain and not a single weed to grow in the fields. You may very well say so, but whoever has been to the fields knows that if weeding is not done there will be weeds galore. Weeds are useful in a way — when ploughed under they can be turned into manure. You say they are of no use? Well, uselessness can be turned into usefulness. The peasants must wage struggles against weeds in the fields year in year out, and so must the writers, artists, critics and professors of our Party against weeds in the ideological held. To say something is tempered means that it has been through a struggle. If weeds grow, we uproot them. This opposite in the contradiction shows itself continually. Weeds will grow even ten thousand years from now, and so we must be prepared to wage struggles for that long.

In short, we have had an eventful year in 1956. Internationally, it was a year in which Khrushchov and Gomulka stirred up storms, and internally, it was a year of very intense socialist transformation. It is still eventful now, and all kinds of ideas will go on obtruding themselves. I hope you comrades here will keep your eyes open.

II. THE TALK OF JANUARY 27

Now, let me take up a few points.

First, we must make an adequate assessment of our achievements. In our revolution and construction, the achievements are primary,

though there are shortcomings and mistakes. Our achievements, however many, must not be exaggerated, but to underestimate them will lead to mistakes, perhaps even to big mistakes. This question was settled at the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee, but repeated references to it at the present conference show that some comrades are still unconvinced. Among the democratic personages in particular there are such remarks as, "You people always say achievements are basic. That doesn't solve any problem. Who doesn't know that achievements are basic, but what about shortcomings and mistakes?" Nonetheless, it is really achievements that are basic. If this is not affirmed, people will be disheartened. Aren't there people who have become disheartened about co-operative transformation?

Second, there must be over-all planning and all-round consideration, so that everyone is provided for. This has been our consistent policy. It was our policy in the Yen-an days. In August 1944, the newspaper *Ta Kung Pao* carried an editorial saying, "Don't set up a separate kitchen." During the Chungking negotiations, I told the man in charge of *Ta Kung Pao* that I quite agreed with what he said, provided Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek took care of our meals, otherwise what else could we do but set up a separate kitchen? At that time we confronted Chiang Kai-shek with the slogan that everyone should be provided for. Now we are running the country. Our policy is still one of over-all planning and all-round consideration so that everyone is provided for. This includes providing for all the army and government personnel left behind by the Kuomintang. Even those who fled to Taiwan can come back. All counter-revolutionaries not to be put to death will undergo remoulding and be given a chance to earn a living. The democratic parties will be preserved and coexist with us for a long time and their members will be provided for. In a word, we will take care of all our country's 600 million people. For instance, through the state monopoly of the purchase and marketing of grain we look after the entire urban population and all rural grain-deficient households. Or take the urban youth for example. Arrangements must be made for them in one way or another — they can go to school or work on a farm, in a factory or in a frontier area. Relief will be extended to families where no member has a job, our principle being not to allow anybody to die of starvation. All this falls within the scope of over-all planning and all-round consideration. What kind of policy is this? It is one of mobilizing all positive forces to build socialism. It is a strategic policy. It is better to follow this

policy, and there will be fewer troubles. This idea of over-all planning and all-round consideration must be made clear to all.

Comrade Ko Ching-shih said that we must explore every possible way. That's well said, for we must explore every possible way of surmounting difficulties. This slogan should be publicized. The difficulties before us are not very great and don't amount to much! Aren't things at least better now than on the Long March, when we had to scale snow-topped mountains and plod through the marshlands? After crossing the Tatu River on the Long March, the question was which way to go. There was nothing but high mountains to the north and very few inhabitants. At that time we called for surmounting the difficulties by a thousand ways and a hundred devices. What do we mean by a thousand ways and a hundred devices? A thousand ways mean 999 ways plus one, and one hundred devices mean 99 devices and another thrown in. You have so far proposed very few ways or devices. How many ways and devices has each of the provinces and the central departments got? Explore every possible way and the difficulties will be surmounted.

Third, the international situation. In the Middle East, there was that Suez Canal incident. A man called Nasser nationalized the canal, another called Eden sent in an invading army, and close on his heels came a third called Eisenhower who decided to drive the British out and have the place all to himself. The British bourgeoisie, past masters of machination and manoeuvre, are a class which knows best when to compromise. But this time they bungled and let the Middle East fall into the hands of the Americans. What a colossal mistake! Can one find many such mistakes in the history of the British bourgeoisie? How come that this time they lost their heads and made such a mistake? Because the pressure exerted by the United States was too much and they lost control of themselves in their anxiety to regain the Middle East and block the United States. Did Britain direct the spearhead chiefly at Egypt? No. Britain's moves were against the United States, much as the moves of the United States were against Britain.

From this incident we can pin-point the focus of struggle in the world today. The contradiction between the imperialist countries and the socialist countries is certainly most acute. But the imperialist countries are now contending with each other for the control of different areas in the name of opposing communism. What areas are they contending for? Areas in Asia and Africa inhabited by 1,000 million people. At present their contention converges on the Middle East, an area of

great strategic significance, and particularly on Egypt's Suez Canal Zone. In the Middle East, two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict. The two kinds of contradictions are: first, those between different imperialist powers, that is, between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France and, second, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed nations. The three kinds of forces are: one, the United States, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate imperialist powers, and three, the oppressed nations. Asia and Africa are today the main areas of imperialist contention. National independence movements have emerged in these regions. The methods the United States employs are now violent, now non-violent, and this is the game it is playing in the Middle East.

Their embroilment is to our advantage. We, the socialist countries, should pursue the policy of consolidating ourselves and not yielding a single inch of our land. We will struggle against anyone who tries to make us do so. This is where we draw the line beyond which they can be left to quarrel among themselves. Then shall we speak up or not? Yes, we shall. We certainly will support the anti-imperialist struggles of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries.

As for the relations between the imperialist countries and ourselves, "they are among us and we are among them". We support the people's revolution in their countries and they conduct subversive activities in ours. We have our men in their midst, that is, the Communists, the revolutionary workers, farmers and intellectuals, and the progressives in their countries. They have their men in our midst, and in China for instance they have among us many people from the bourgeoisie and the democratic parties and also the landlord class. At present, these people seem to be behaving themselves and are not causing trouble. But what will they do if an atom bomb is dropped on Peking? They won't revolt? That's highly questionable. Still more so in the case of those criminals now undergoing reform through labour, those ringleaders who created disturbances in that school in Shihchiachuang, and that college student in Peking who wanted to have thousands and tens of thousands of people shot. We must absorb them and transform the landlords and capitalists into working people. This is also a strategic policy. It takes a very long time to abolish classes.

In short, our assessment of the international situation is still that the embroilment of the imperialist countries contending for colonies

is the greater contradiction. They try to cover up the contradictions between themselves by playing up their contradictions with us. We can make use of their contradictions, a lot can be done in this connection. This is a matter of importance for our external policy.

Now a few words about Sino-American relations. We have had Eisenhower's letter to Chiang Kai-shek reproduced and distributed among you. In my view, the letter is meant chiefly to pour cold water on Chiang Kai-shek and then pump a little courage into him. The letter talks about the need to keep cool and not to be impulsive, which means not resorting to war but relying on the United Nations. That's pouring cold water. For Chiang Kai-shek has really become rather impulsive. To pump courage into Chiang Kai-shek, Eisenhower says he will continue his hard-line policy towards the Communists and pins his hopes on disturbances breaking out in our midst. In Eisenhower's view, disturbances have already occurred and the Communists cannot stop them. Well, everybody has his own way of looking at things.

I still think it preferable to put off the establishment of diplomatic relations with the United States for some years. This will be more to our advantage. The Soviet Union established diplomatic relations with the United States seventeen years after the October Revolution. In 1929 a world-wide economic crisis broke out which lasted through 1933. In 1933 Hitler came to power in Germany and Roosevelt in the United States. And it was only then that diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and the United States. It will probably be after our Third Five-Year Plan that we will establish diplomatic relations with the United States, that is, eighteen years or even more from the day of liberation. We are in no hurry to take our seat in the United Nations, just as we are in no hurry to establish diplomatic relations with the United States. We adopt this policy to deprive the United States of as much political capital as possible and put it in the wrong and in an isolated position. You bar us from the United Nations and don't want to establish diplomatic relations with us; all right, but the longer you stall, the more you will be in debt to us. The longer you stall, the more you will be in the wrong and the more isolated you will become in your own country and before world opinion. Once I told an American in Yen-an, the United States can go on withholding recognition of our government for a hundred years, but I doubt if it can withhold it in the 101st. One day the United States will have to establish diplomatic relations with us.

When the Americans come to China then and look around, they will find it too late for regrets. For this land of China will have become quite different, with its house swept clean and the “four pests” eliminated; they won’t find many friends here and they can’t do much even if they spread a few germs.

Since World War II, the capitalist countries have been very unstable and in deep turmoil, with anxiety widespread among their people. There is anxiety in all countries, China included. But there is less here anyway. Look into the matter and see who is actually afraid of whom — the socialist countries of the imperialist countries, principally the United States, or the other way round. I say there is fear on both sides. The question is, which side is more afraid of the other? I’m inclined to think that the imperialists are more afraid of us. There may be some danger in making such an assessment, that is, our people may all go to bed and sleep for three days on end. So we must take two possibilities into account. In addition to the favourable possibility, there is the unfavourable one, and that is the imperialists may go berserk. They harbour evil designs and are always out to make trouble. Of course, today it is not so easy for them to start another world war, for they have to think of the consequences.

Now a few words about Sino-Soviet relations. In my view, wrangling is inevitable. Let no one imagine that there is no wrangling between Communist Parties. How can there be no wrangling in this world of ours? Marxism is a wrangling *ism*, dealing as it does with contradictions and struggles. Contradictions are always present, and where there are contradictions there are struggles. Now there are some contradictions between China and the Soviet Union. The way they think, the way they do things and their traditional habits are different from ours. So we must work on them. I always say that we should work on our comrades. Some people say, since they are Communists, they should be as good as we are, so why is such work needed? To work on people means doing united front work, working on the democratic personages, but why on Communists? It is wrong to look at the matter this way. There are different opinions inside the Communist Party itself. Some people have joined the Party organizationally, but ideologically they still need to be straightened out. And even among veteran cadres there are some who do not talk the same language as we do. Therefore, it is often necessary to have heart-to-heart talks, confer individually or collectively and hold meetings more than once to help people straighten out their thinking.

In my opinion, circumstances are more powerful than individuals, even than high officials. The force of circumstances will make it impossible for those die-hard elements in the Soviet Union to get anywhere if they continue to push their great-nation chauvinism. Our present policy is still to help them by talking things over with them face to face. This time when our delegation went to the Soviet Union, we came straight to the point on a number of questions. I told Comrade Chou En-lai over the phone that these people are blinded by their material gains and the best way to deal with them is to give them a good dressing down. What are their material gains? Nothing but 50 million tons of steel, 400 million tons of coal, and 80 million tons of petroleum. Does this amount to much? Not at all. Now at the sight of this much their heads are swelled. What Communists! What Marxists! I say multiply all that tenfold, or even a hundredfold, it still doesn't amount to much. All you have done is to extract something from the earth, turn it into steel and make some cars, planes, and what not. What is so remarkable about that? And yet you make all this such a heavy burden on your backs that you even cast away revolutionary principles. Isn't this being blinded by material gains? If one attains high office, one can be blinded by material gain too. To be the first secretary is some kind of material gain, which is also liable to swell one's head. When a man's head gets too swelled, we have to give him a good bawling out one way or another. This time in Moscow, Comrade Chou En-lai did not stand on ceremony and took them on, and consequently they kicked up a row. This is good, straightening things out face to face. They tried to influence us and we tried to influence them. However, we didn't come straight to the point on every question, we didn't play all our cards but kept some up our sleeves. There will always be contradictions. As long as things are tolerable on the whole, we can seek common grounds and reserve differences, to be dealt with later. If they insist on having their own way, sooner or later we will have to bring everything into the open.

As for us, we mustn't talk big in our external propaganda. We must always be modest and prudent and must, so to speak, tuck our tail between our legs. We must continue to learn from the Soviet Union. However, we must do it selectively, learning only what is advanced and not what is backward. In regard to what is backward there is another way of learning — just don't. As for their mistakes, we can avoid repeating them if we know about them. As for those things of theirs which are useful to us, we must learn them by all

means. We shall learn what is useful from every country in the world. One should go everywhere in search of knowledge. To go to one place only would be monotonous.

Fourth, let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend. This policy was advanced following the repudiation of the counter-revolutionary Hu Feng clique, and I think it remains correct because it accords with dialectics.

Concerning dialectics Lenin said, "In brief, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This grasps the kernel of dialectics, but it requires explanations and development."² It is our job to explain and develop the doctrine. It needs to be explained, and so far we have done too little. And it needs to be developed; with our rich experience in revolution, we ought to develop this doctrine. Lenin also said, "The unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute."³ Proceeding from this concept, we have advanced the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend.

Truth stands in contrast to falsehood and develops in struggle with it. The beautiful stands in contrast to the ugly and develops in struggle with it. The same holds true of good and bad, that is, good deeds and good people stand in contrast to bad deeds and bad people and develop in struggle with them. In short, fragrant flowers stand in contrast to poisonous weeds and develop in struggle with them. It is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile, with idealism and metaphysics and with the twaddle of Confucius, Lao Tzu and Chiang Kai-shek. It will lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world and meet challenges.

In philosophy, materialism and idealism form a unity of opposites and struggle with each other. The same is true of another pair of opposites, dialectics and metaphysics. Whenever one talks about philosophy, one cannot do without these two pairs of opposites. Now in the Soviet Union they will have nothing to do with such "pairs" but are going in only for "singles", asserting that only fragrant flowers, but not poisonous weeds, grow there, and denying the existence of idealism and metaphysics in a socialist country. As a matter of fact, idealism, metaphysics and poisonous weeds are found in every country. In the Soviet Union many of the poisonous weeds appear in the

name of fragrant flowers, and many absurd statements bear the label of materialism or socialist realism. We openly recognize the struggle between materialism and idealism, between dialectics and metaphysics, and between fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds. This struggle will go on for ever and will move a step forward at every stage.

If you comrades here already know materialism and dialectics, I would like to advise you to supplement your knowledge by some study of their opposites, that is, idealism and metaphysics. You should read Kant and Hegel and Confucius and Chiang Kai-shek, which are all negative stuff. If you know nothing about idealism and metaphysics, if you have never waged any struggle against them, your materialism and dialectics will not be solid. The shortcoming of some of our Party's members and intellectuals is precisely that they know too little about the negative stuff. Having read a few books by Marx, they just repeat what is in them and sound rather monotonous. Their speeches and articles are not convincing. If you don't study the negative stuff, you won't be able to refute it. Neither Marx nor Engels nor Lenin was like that. They made great efforts to learn and study all sorts of things, contemporary and past, and taught other people to do likewise. The three component parts of Marxism came into being in the course of their study of, as well as their struggle with, such bourgeois things as German classical philosophy, English classical political economy and French utopian socialism. In this respect Stalin was not as good. For instance, in his time, German classical idealist philosophy was described as a reaction on the part of the German aristocracy to the French revolution. This conclusion totally negates German classical idealist philosophy. Stalin negated German military science, alleging that it was no longer of any use and that books by Clausewitz⁴ should no longer be read since the Germans had been defeated.

Stalin had a fair amount of metaphysics in him and he taught many people to follow metaphysics. In the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*, Stalin says that Marxist dialectics has four principal features. As the first feature he talks of the interconnection of things, as if all things happened to be interconnected for no reason at all. What then are the things that are interconnected? It is the two contradictory aspects of a thing that are interconnected. Everything has two contradictory aspects. As the fourth feature he talks of the internal contradiction in all things, but then he deals only with the struggle of opposites, without mentioning

their unity. According to the basic law of dialectics, the unity of opposites, there is at once struggle and unity between the opposites, which are both mutually exclusive and interconnected and which under given conditions transform themselves into each other.

Stalin's viewpoint is reflected in the entry on "identity" in the *Shorter Dictionary of Philosophy*, fourth edition, compiled in the Soviet Union. It is said there: "There can be no identity between war and peace, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between life and death and other such phenomena, because they are fundamentally opposed to each other and mutually exclusive." In other words, between these fundamentally opposed phenomena there is no identity in the Marxist sense; rather, they are solely mutually exclusive, not interconnected, and incapable of transforming themselves into each other under given conditions. This interpretation is utterly wrong.

In their view, war is war and peace is peace, the two are mutually exclusive and entirely unconnected, and war cannot be transformed into peace, nor peace into war. Lenin quoted Clausewitz, "War is the continuation of politics by other means."⁵ Struggle in peace-time is politics, so is war, though certain special means are used. War and peace are both mutually exclusive and interconnected and can be transformed into each other under given conditions. If war is not brewing in peace-time, how can it possibly break out all of a sudden? If peace is not brewing in wartime, how can it suddenly come about?

If life and death cannot be transformed into each other, then please tell me where living things come from. Originally there was only non-living matter on earth, and living things did not come into existence until later, when they were transformed from non-living matter, that is, dead matter. All living matter undergoes a process of metabolism: it grows, reproduces and perishes. While life is in progress, life and death are engaged in a constant struggle and are being transformed into each other all the time.

If the bourgeoisie and the proletariat cannot transform themselves into each other, how come that through revolution the proletariat becomes the ruler and the bourgeoisie the ruled? For instance, we stood in diametrical opposition to Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. As a result of the mutual struggle and the mutual exclusion of the two opposing sides, a change took place in our status and theirs, that is, they turned from the ruler into the ruled, whereas we turned from the ruled into the ruler. Those who fled to Taiwan were only one-tenth of the Kuomintang, those remaining on the mainland accounting

for nine-tenths. The latter are being remoulded by us; this is a case of the unity of opposites under new circumstances. As for the one-tenth who have gone to Taiwan, our relationship with them is still a unity of opposites, and they, too, will be transformed through struggle.

Stalin failed to see the connection between the struggle of opposites and the unity of opposites. Some people in the Soviet Union are so metaphysical and rigid in their thinking that they think a thing has to be either one or the other, refusing to recognize the unity of opposites. Hence, political mistakes are made. We adhere to the concept of the unity of opposites and adopt the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend. When fragrant flowers are blossoming, you will inevitably find poisonous weeds growing. This is nothing to be afraid of, under given conditions they can even be turned to good account.

Some phenomena are unavoidable at a given time, and after their occurrence a way will be found to cope with them. For example, in the past rigid control was exercised over the repertory of drama and this or that piece was banned. Once the ban was lifted, all sorts of plays about ghosts and monsters such as *The Story of a Haunted Black Basin* and *Retribution by the God of Thunder* appeared on the stage. What do you think of this phenomenon? I think their appearance is all to the good. Many people have never seen ghosts and monsters on the stage, and when they see these ugly images, they will realize that things are being staged which should not be staged. Then these shows will be criticized, changed or banned. Some say that a few local operas are so bad that even the local people disapprove of them. In my opinion, it is all right to stage some of them. Let practice decide whether they can survive and how large an audience they will draw, so don't be in a rush to ban them.

We have now decided to increase the circulation of *News for Reference* from 2,000 to 400,000 so that it can be read by people both inside and outside the Party. This is a case of a Communist Party publishing a newspaper for imperialism, as it even carries reactionary statements vilifying us. Why should we do this? The purpose is to put poisonous weeds and what is non-Marxist and anti-Marxist before our comrades, before the masses and the democratic personages, so that they can be tempered. Don't seal these things up, otherwise it would be dangerous. In this respect our approach is different from that of the Soviet Union. Why is vaccination necessary? A virus is artificially

introduced into a man's body to wage "germ warfare" against him in order to bring about immunity. The publication of *News for Reference* and other negative teaching material is "vaccination" to increase the political immunity of the cadres and the masses.

Harmful statements should be refuted forcefully and in good time. A case in point is the article "On Unavoidability" in the *People's Daily*, which asserts that mistakes in our work are not unavoidable and that we use the word "unavoidable" as an excuse for these mistakes. This is a harmful statement. Perhaps that article should not have been published. Since it was to be published, preparations ought to have been made to meet the challenge with a timely refutation. In our revolution and construction some mistakes are unavoidable in any case, as past experience has proved. The article "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" deals precisely with a major case of unavoidability. Who among our comrades wants to make mistakes? Mistakes are not recognized until after they are made, and at first everyone considers himself a 100 per cent Marxist. Of course we should not think that since mistakes are unavoidable, it does not matter if we make some. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that it is definitely impossible not to make any mistake in our work. The point is to make fewer and smaller ones.

Bad trends in society must definitely be overcome. Whether inside the Party, among the democratic personages or among students, bad trends, that is, mistakes which are not those of a few individuals but which have developed into trends, must definitely be overcome. The way to do so is through reasoning. So long as the reasoning is convincing, it is possible to overcome bad trends. If it is not convincing and only a few words of condemnation are used, these trends will go from bad to worse. Where major issues are involved, full preparations should be made, and wholly convincing refutations should be published when success is certain. Party secretaries should personally supervise the newspapers and write articles.

Of the two opposing aspects of a unity in struggle with each other, one must be principal and the other secondary. In our state which is a dictatorship of the proletariat, poisonous weeds should of course not be allowed to spread unchecked. Whether inside the Party or in ideological or in literary and art circles, we must endeavour to make sure that fragrant flowers and Marxism occupy the chief and dominant position. Poisonous weeds and what is non-Marxist and anti-Marxist must be kept in the subordinate position. In a sense, the

relationship between the two can be compared to that between the nucleus and the electrons in an atom. An atom has two parts, the nucleus and the electrons. The nucleus is very small but very heavy. The electrons are very light, in fact an electron weighs only about $1/1,800$ th of the lightest nucleus. The nucleus of an atom can also be split, only its binding force is stronger. The electrons are somewhat guilty of "liberalism", with some going and others coming. The relationship between the nucleus and the electrons in an atom is also a unity of opposites, one being principal and the other secondary. Seen from this viewpoint, the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend is beneficial, not harmful.

Fifth, the question of disturbances. In socialist society the creation of disturbances by small numbers of people presents a new problem which is well worth looking into.

Everything in society is a unity of opposites. Socialist society is likewise a unity of opposites; this unity of opposites exists both within the ranks of the people and between ourselves and the enemy. The basic reason why small numbers of people still create disturbances in our country is that all kinds of opposing aspects, positive and negative, still exist in society, as do opposing classes, opposing people and opposing views.

We have basically completed the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, but the bourgeoisie are still around, and also the landlords and rich peasants, local tyrants and counter-revolutionaries. They are the expropriated classes and are being oppressed by us, they nurse hatred in their hearts and many of them will give vent to it at the first opportunity. At the time of the Hungarian incident they hoped that Hungary would be thrown into chaos and, best of all, China too. That is their class instinct.

The queer statements of some democratic personages and professors are also in opposition to our views. They preach idealism whereas we advocate materialism. They say that the Communist Party is unable to direct the sciences, that there is nothing superior about socialism and that co-operative transformation is very bad indeed, whereas we say that the Communist Party has the ability to direct the sciences, that socialism is superior and that co-operative transformation is excellent.

Among the students there are also quite a few who stand opposed to us. Since most of today's college students come from exploiting

class families, no wonder some of them are opposed to us. Such persons can be found in Peking, Shihchiachuang and elsewhere.

There are certain persons in society who vilify our provincial Party committees as "mummies". Are they mummies? In my view, they are not dead at all, so how can they be mummies? These fellows vilify our provincial Party committees as "mummies", we say they are not, and the two views stand opposed to each other.

Opposing views are also found inside our Party. For instance, two opposing views, pro and con, exist about the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU finishing Stalin off with one blow. Differences of opinion constantly occur inside the Party; no sooner has unanimity been reached than new differences arise within a month or two.

With respect to the way people think, subjectivism and seeking truth from the facts are opposed to each other. I believe there will always be subjectivism. Will there be no trace of subjectivism ten thousand years from now? I don't think so.

Opposing sides exist in a factory, an agricultural co-operative, a school, an organization or a family, in short, in every place and at every time. Therefore, disturbances by small numbers of people in society will occur every year.

Then, should we be afraid of disturbances or not? We Communists have never feared imperialism, Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, the landlord class or the bourgeoisie, and it would be really strange if we should now be afraid of students creating disturbances or peasants kicking up a row in a co-operative! Only Tuan Chi-jui and Chiang Kai-shek were afraid of disturbances by the masses. Some people in Hungary and in the Soviet Union are afraid as well. We should adopt an active, and not a passive, attitude towards disturbances by small numbers of people, that is to say, we should not be afraid of them but be ready for them. Being afraid is no solution. The more you are afraid, the more the ghosts will haunt you. If you are not afraid of disturbances and are mentally prepared for them, you will not be put on the defensive. I think we should be prepared for major incidents. When you are thus prepared, such incidents may not happen, but when you are not, disturbances will occur.

In the development of a thing, there are only two possibilities, either a good one or a bad one. Both should be taken into consideration in dealing with international and domestic problems. You say this will be a year of peace, well, perhaps it will be. But it would not be good to base your work on this estimate, rather you should base it on the assumption

that the worst may happen. Internationally, the worst would be at most the outbreak of a world war and the dropping of atom bombs. At home, it would be at most nation-wide riots, or a "Hungarian incident", with several million people rising up against us, occupying a few hundred counties and advancing on Peking. All we would need to do then would be to go back to Yen-an where we came from. We have already lived in Peking for seven years, and what if we are requested to return to Yen-an in the eighth? Would we all lament our loss and cry our hearts out? Of course we don't intend to return to Yen-an now, to "make a feint and turn the horse round to retreat". At the Seventh Congress, I said that we should anticipate seventeen difficulties, among them, a thousand *li* of parched land, severe natural calamities, famine and the loss of all the county towns. It was because we had taken all this into account that the initiative was always in our hands. Now that we have won state power, we should still anticipate the worst possibilities.

In some cases, disturbances by small numbers of people were due to bureaucracy and subjectivism on the part of the leadership and to mistakes in our political or economic policies. In other cases, they were due to the incorrectness not of our policies but of our method of work, which was too rigid. Another factor was the existence of counter-revolutionaries and bad elements. It is impossible completely to avoid disturbances by small numbers of people. Here is a case of unavoidability again. But as long as we do not make major mistakes in political line, big nation-wide disturbances will not occur. Even if they do occur owing to such mistakes, I think they will quickly subside and not lead to national ruin. Of course, if we fail to do our work well, it is still quite possible that history will to some extent reverse its course and move backward a little. The Revolution of 1911 did suffer reversals; after it dethroned the emperor, another emperor and then the warlords came on the scene. Problems give rise to revolution and after the revolution other problems crop up. If a big nation-wide disturbance flares up, I am sure the masses and their leaders, maybe we ourselves or maybe others, will certainly come forward to clean up the situation. Through a big disturbance of this kind, our country will emerge all the stronger after the boil has burst. Whatever happens, China will march on.

As for small numbers of people creating disturbances, in the first place, we do not encourage this, and in the second, if some people are bent on creating disturbances, then let them. Freedom of procession

and demonstration is provided for in our Constitution, and although freedom to strike is not provided for, it is not prohibited either, so to go on strike does not violate the Constitution. If some people want to stage a strike or present a petition and you obstinately try to prevent them, that is not good. In my opinion, whoever wants to make trouble may do so for as long as he pleases, and if one month is not enough, he may go on for two, in short, the matter should not be wound up until he feels he has had enough. If you hastily wind it up, sooner or later he will make trouble again. Where students make trouble, don't give the school a vacation but fight the matter out as at the Battle of Chihpi in ancient times. What good will come of this? It will help to expose problems to the full and to draw a clear distinction between right and wrong, so that everyone can be tempered and those who are unreasonable, those bad types, will suffer defeat.

You should learn this art of leadership. Don't always try to keep a lid on everything. Whenever people utter queer remarks, go on strike or present a petition, you try to beat them back with one blow, always thinking that these things ought not to occur. Why is it then that these things which ought not to occur still do? This very fact proves that they ought to occur. You forbid people to strike, to petition or to make unfavourable comments, you simply resort to repression in every case, until one day you become a Rakosi. This is true both inside and outside the Party. As for queer remarks, strange happenings and contradictions, it is better to have them exposed. Contradictions must be exposed and then resolved.

Disturbances should be differentiated into several categories and handled accordingly. In one category there are the justifiable disturbances, in which case we should admit our mistakes and correct them. In another category there are the unjustifiable ones, and these we must rebut. Disturbances having good grounds ought to occur; groundless ones will get nowhere. In yet another category, the disturbances are partly justifiable and partly not, and we should accept what is justifiable and criticize what is not; here we must not give way at every step in total disregard of principle and promise to do whatever is demanded. Don't be too ready to use force or to open fire on people, except in the case of a real, large-scale counter-revolutionary rebellion which necessitates armed suppression. In the March 18th Massacre⁶ which he staged, Tuan Chi-jui resorted to shooting, and he eventually brought himself down. We mustn't follow his example.

We must work well among those involved in disturbances to split them and differentiate the many from the few. Give the many proper guidance and education so that they can gradually change, and don't hurt them. I believe it is true everywhere that people at the two poles are few while those in the middle are many. Win over the middle section step by step and we will get the upper hand. We must make an analysis of riot leaders. Some of those who dare to take the lead in rioting may become useful people through education. As for the handful of bad types, we need not arrest, jail or expel any except those guilty of the gravest offences. Let them stay on in their own unit but strip them of their political capital, isolate them and use them as teachers by negative example. When Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping went to make a speech at Tsinghua University, he asked the student who had threatened to kill thousands and tens of thousands of people to serve as a teacher. A fellow like him has no arms, not even a pistol, why should you be afraid of him? If you expel him right away, you will have a clean house but then you'll not win general approval. Expelled from your place, he'll have to find a job in some other place. Therefore, to expel people like him in haste is not a good way. Such people represent the reactionary classes, and it is not a question of just a few individuals. To deal with them too crudely is good riddance, but their function as teachers by negative example will not be fully utilized. In the Soviet Union, when college students create trouble, the practice is to expel a few ringleaders, and it is not realized that bad things can serve us as teaching material. Of course, dictatorship must be exercised over the very few who stage such counter-revolutionary rebellions as the Hungarian incident.

We should allow democratic personages to challenge us with opposing views and give them a free hand to criticize us. Otherwise we would be a little like the Kuomintang. The Kuomintang was mortally afraid of criticism and went in fear and trepidation each time the Political Council was in session. Criticisms from democratic personages can be of only two kinds, those that are wrong and those that are not. Criticisms that are not wrong can help remedy our shortcomings while wrong ones must be refuted. As for such types as Liang Shu-ming, Peng Yi-hu and Chang Nai-chi, if they want to fart, let them. That will be to our advantage, for everybody can judge whether the smell is good or foul, and through discussion the majority can be won over and these types isolated. If they want to create trouble, let them have their fill of it. He who perpetrates many

injustices is doomed to self-ruin. The falser their words and the greater their mistakes, the better, and the more isolated they will become and the better they will educate the people by negative example. We must both unite with and struggle against the democratic personages and, according to the circumstances, work among them on our own initiative in some cases, while in others let them expose themselves before we take action rather than striking first.

The struggle against bourgeois ideology, against bad men and bad things, is a long-term one which will take several decades or even centuries. The working class, the other sections of the working people and the revolutionary intellectuals will gain experience and temper themselves in the course of struggle, and this is a great advantage.

A bad thing has a dual character — good as well as bad. Many comrades are still not clear on this point. A bad thing contains good factors as well. To regard bad people and bad things as solely bad is a one-sided, metaphysical approach to problems; it is not a dialectical approach or a Marxist way of looking at things. On the one hand, bad people and bad things are bad, but on the other they can play a good role. For instance, a bad fellow like Wang Ming plays a good role as a teacher by negative example. Similarly, a good thing contains bad factors as well. For instance, the tremendous victories won in the seven years since liberation, especially those won last year, have given some comrades swelled heads, made them conceited, and they are caught unawares at the sudden outbreak of disturbances by small numbers of people.

The root cause of being afraid of disturbances on the one hand and handling them crudely on the other is the refusal to recognize in one's thinking that socialist society is a unity of opposites, in which contradictions, classes and class struggle exist.

For a long time Stalin denied that contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base exist under the socialist system. Not until the year before his death when he wrote *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* did he hesitantly mention the contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces under the socialist system and admit that incorrect policies and improper adjustments would lead to trouble. Even then he did not pose the question of the contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic

base under the socialist system as a question of over-all importance, nor did he realize that they are the basic contradictions which propel socialist society forward. He thought all was secure under his rule. We on our part mustn't presume that all is secure under our rule; it is secure and yet insecure.

According to dialectics, as surely as a man must die, the socialist system as a historical phenomenon will come to an end some day, to be negated by the communist system. If it is asserted that the socialist system and its relations of production and superstructure will not die out, what kind of Marxism would that be? Wouldn't it be the same as a religious creed or theology that preaches an everlasting God?

How to handle the contradictions between the people and the enemy and those among the people in socialist society is a branch of science worthy of careful study. In the conditions prevailing in our country, although the present class struggle partly consists of contradictions between the people and the enemy, it finds expression on a vast scale in contradictions among the people. The disturbances stirred up by a small number of people at the moment are a reflection of this situation. If the earth is to perish ten thousand years from now, then at least disturbances will go on occurring for these ten thousand years. However, things happening in so remote a future as ten thousand years hence won't be our business. What we are concerned with is to make serious efforts to gain experience in handling this problem within the space of several five-year plans.

Strengthen our work and overcome our mistakes and shortcomings. What kind of work should be strengthened? Political and ideological work in the spheres of industry, agriculture, commerce, culture and education as well as in the army, government and Party. You are all preoccupied with your professional duties, with your day-to-day work in economic, cultural and educational, national defence and Party matters, but if you neglect political and ideological work, that will be very dangerous. Now that our Party General Secretary Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping has turned up personally at Tsinghua University and given a talk, I would like all of you to get cracking. The leading comrades of the Central Committee as well as of the provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees should all personally take on political and ideological work. After World War II, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and certain East European Parties no longer concerned themselves with the basic principles of Marxism. They no longer concerned themselves with class struggle, the dictatorship of

the proletariat, Party leadership, democratic centralism and the ties between the Party and the masses, and there wasn't much of a political atmosphere. The Hungarian incident was the consequence. We must adhere to the basic theory of Marxism. Every province, every municipality and autonomous region should take up theoretical work and systematically train Marxist theorists and critics.

Streamline our organizations. The state is an instrument of class struggle. A class is not to be equated with the state which is formed by a number of people (a small number) from the class in the dominant position. Office work does need some people, but the fewer the better. At present the state apparatus is bloated, with many departments and with many people sitting idle in their offices. This problem cries out for solution. First, cut the personnel; second, make appropriate arrangements and see to it that those to be discharged have a place to go to. The above applies equally to the Party, the government and the army.

Go down to the grass roots and study the problems there. I hope that the comrades on the Central Committee and the leading comrades in charge of the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions and of the central departments will all do this. I have heard that many leading comrades no longer do so, which is not good. The central organs are miserable places where you can get no knowledge at all. If you are seeking knowledge, you won't find any by staying put in your office. The factories, the co-operatives and the shops are the real sources of knowledge. If you stay in your office, you will never get a clear idea of how factories, co-operatives and shops are run. The higher the office, the less the knowledge. To tackle problems, you must go down personally or invite people to come up. If you neither go down nor invite people to come up, you won't be able to solve any problem. I suggest that the secretary of a provincial, municipal or autonomous region Party committee serve concurrently as secretary of a county Party committee or of a factory or school Party committee and that the secretary of a prefectural or a county Party committee do likewise in a subordinate unit. In this way they can gain experience for giving over-all guidance.

Keep in close touch with the masses. Alienation from the masses and bureaucracy are sure to bring punishment upon one's head. The Hungarian leaders were ignorant of the conditions among the masses for lack of investigation and study, and when large-scale disturbances broke out they did not know what had gone wrong. There

have been cases of late in which the leaders of some of our central departments and provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees did not keep tabs on the ideological trends among the masses, were completely unaware of the disturbances and riots being brewed by some people and were consequently at a loss when something happened. We must take warning from this state of affairs. Comrades on the Central Committee and leading comrades in charge of the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions and of the central departments should take some time out each year to visit grass-roots units such as factories, agricultural co-operatives, shops and schools to make investigation and study and find out the political conditions of the masses, how many are advanced, backward or in between and how well our mass work is going, and thus get a clear picture of the situation. Rely on the working class, on the poor and lower-middle peasants and on the advanced elements, for reliance there must be. Only thus can incidents such as that in Hungary be avoided.

Sixth, the question of the legal system. I am going to make three points: the law must be observed, counter-revolutionaries must be eliminated, and our achievements in eliminating counter-revolutionaries must be affirmed.

The law must be observed and the revolutionary legal system must not be undermined. Laws form part of the superstructure. Our laws are made by the working people themselves. They are designed to maintain revolutionary order and protect the interests of the working people, the socialist economic base and the productive forces. We require everybody, and not just the democratic personages, to respect the revolutionary legal system.

Counter-revolutionaries must be eliminated. Where this task has not yet been completed according to plan, it must be completed this year, and if there are still loose ends to tie up, the work must be finished next year without fail. Some units went through the campaign to eliminate counter-revolutionaries but the work was not thorough, and it is necessary to clear them all out gradually in the course of struggle. There are not many counter-revolutionaries left, a fact that must be affirmed. Where disturbances break out, the masses will not follow the counter-revolutionaries, and those who do are few in number and do so only for a time. On the other hand, it must also be affirmed that there are still counter-revolutionaries and that the work of eliminating them is not yet finished.

Our achievements in eliminating counter-revolutionaries must be affirmed. They are great achievements. There are also mistakes, which of course should be taken seriously. We should back up the cadres doing the work of eliminating counter-revolutionaries, and there mustn't be any softening because of abuse from some democratic personages. These fellows have been at it day after day, they have nothing better to do after a good meal except abuse people; well, let them. In my opinion, the more abusive they are, the better; anyway no amount of abuse can controvert the three points I've dealt with.

No one knows how much abuse has been hurled at the Communist Party. The Kuomintang vilified us as "Communist bandits", and if people had the slightest contact with us, they were accused of "having contact with bandits". In the end it is the "bandits" who have proved to be better than the "non-bandits". From time immemorial, nothing progressive has ever been favourably received at first and everything progressive has invariably been the object of abuse. Marxism and the Communist Party have been abused from the very beginning. Even ten thousand years hence, things progressive will still be abused at the outset.

Keep up the work of eliminating counter-revolutionaries, and eliminate them wherever they are found. The legal system must be respected. Acting in accordance with the law does not mean being bound hand and foot. It is wrong to be bound hand and foot and not to eliminate counter-revolutionaries where they are found. Be sure to act in accordance with the law and with hands and feet unfettered.

Seventh, the question of agriculture. We should strive for a good harvest this year. A good harvest this year will give people a sense of security and significantly consolidate the co-operatives. In the Soviet Union and in some East European countries, agricultural collectivization invariably brought about decreases in grain production for a number of years. We have had agricultural co-operation for several years, and we went all out last year, yet, far from falling, our grain production has increased. If another good harvest is reaped this year, there will be no parallel in the history of the agricultural co-operative movement as well as in the history of the international communist movement.

The whole Party should attach great importance to agriculture. Agriculture has vital bearing on the nation's economy and the people's livelihood. Take heed, for it is very dangerous not to grasp

grain production. If this is ignored, there will be widespread disorder some day.

(1) Agriculture is vital to a rural population of 500 million for the supply of grain, meat, edible oils and other agricultural products for daily use consumed at source. This portion of agricultural products consumed at source by the peasants is enormous. For instance, of the more than 360,000 million catties of grain produced last year, commodity grain, including grain delivered to the state, accounted for some 80,000 million catties, or less than a quarter of the total, while the remaining three quarters and more went to the peasants. If agriculture is in good shape and the peasants are self-supporting, then 500 million people will feel secure.

(2) Agriculture is vital for the supply of food to the population in urban, industrial and mining areas. Only when the production of agricultural products for the market is increased can the needs of the industrial population be met and industry developed. With rising agricultural production, we should gradually increase the proportion of agricultural products entering the market, and particularly commodity grain. When everybody has a regular meal, we need not worry about a handful of people stirring up trouble in schools and factories.

(3) Agriculture is the chief source of raw materials for light industry, for which the countryside provides an important market. Only when agriculture is developed can light industry get enough raw materials and find a vast market for its goods.

(4) Here again the countryside is an important market for heavy industry. For example, chemical fertilizer, farm machinery of all kinds and part of our electric power, coal and petroleum are all supplied to the rural areas, and the railways, the highways and the large water conservancy projects all serve agriculture. Now that we have built up a socialist agricultural economy, the countryside is becoming an immense market for our growing heavy and light industries.

(5) Agricultural products make up the bulk of our exports at present. They earn foreign exchange with which to import various kinds of industrial equipment.

(6) Agriculture is an important source of accumulation. When expanded, it can provide more funds for the development of industry.

Therefore we may say that in a sense agriculture is itself industry. We should persuade the industrial departments to face the countryside and support agriculture. This must be done if industrialization is to be realized.

In the earnings of the co-operatives, what should be the right proportion between the accumulation earmarked for agriculture and the accumulation taken from agriculture by the state? Please consider this matter and work out the appropriate proportion. The aim is to enable agriculture to expand reproduction, to provide a larger market for industry and to become a greater source of accumulation. First, let agriculture accumulate more for itself, for only then can it accumulate more for industry. If agriculture accumulated only for industry and very little or none for itself, that would mean "draining the pond to get all the fish" and would only harm the development of industry.

Attention should also be paid to the ratio between accumulation for the co-operative and the income of the co-operative members. In order to increase accumulation bit by bit, the co-operatives should make use of the law of value and adopt economic accounting, and they should be run with diligence and thrift. If there is a good harvest this year, their accumulation should be a little more than last year, but not too much, for it's better to let the peasants have more to eat first. Accumulate more in good years and less or none in years when the crops half fail or totally fail. In other words, accumulation proceeds in a wave-like manner or in spirals. Since everything in the world is itself a contradiction, a unity of opposites, its movement and development is wave-like. The light emitted by the sun is called light waves, the waves transmitted by radio stations are called radio waves, and sound is carried by sound waves. Water moves in water waves and heat in heat waves. In a sense, walking also proceeds in waves, the step-by-step movement constituting waves. Opera-singing also proceeds in waves, with the singer singing one line after another, never seven or eight lines all at the same time. Handwriting too is done in waves, for people write one word after another and not several hundred words with one stroke of the pen. Such is the undulatory nature of the movement of opposites in all things.

In a word, we must act in accordance with dialectics. So said Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping. In my opinion, the whole Party should study dialectics and advocate acting in accordance with dialectics. The whole Party should pay attention to ideological and theoretical work, build up contingents of Marxist theoretical workers and devote greater efforts to studying and propagating Marxist theory. The Marxist theory of the unity of opposites must be applied in examining and handling the

new problems of class contradiction and class struggle in socialist society and also the new problems in the international struggle.

NOTES

¹ The payment of a fixed rate of interest was a means employed by the state in the course of socialist transformation to implement its policy of redemption with regard to the national bourgeoisie's means of production. After the conversion of capitalist industry and commerce into joint state-private enterprises by whole trades in 1956, the state paid the national bourgeoisie a fixed annual rate of interest on the money value of their assets for a given period of time. In its nature this interest was still a form of exploitation.

² V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's *The Science of Logic*".

³ V. I. Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics".

⁴ Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831), the well-known German bourgeois military scientist. Among his chief works is *On War*. For Stalin's comment on Clausewitz see Stalin's "Letter in Reply to Comrade Razin".

⁵ V. I. Lenin, "War and Revolution".

⁶ In March 1926, during the war between Feng Yu-hsiang's National Army and the northeastern warlord Chang Tso-lin, the Japanese imperialists brazenly sent naval vessels to provide cover for Chang's troops who were attacking Feng's troops stationed at Taku Port. Thwarted, the Japanese aggressors, working hand in glove with seven other countries including Britain and the United States, sent the Chinese government an ultimatum, with insolent demands such as that for the dismantling of the defence works at Taku Port. On March 18, thousands of Peking workers, students and citizens held a protest rally in front of Tien An Men and started a demonstration. When the demonstrators reached the government building and demanded the rejection of the eight-power ultimatum, Tuan Chi-jui, the chief of the Northern warlord government, ordered the guards to fire and the demonstrators were slaughtered in cold blood.

ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE

February 27, 1957

Our general subject is the correct handling of contradictions among the people. For convenience, let us discuss it under twelve sub-headings. Although reference will be made to contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, this discussion will centre on contradictions among the people.

I. TWO TYPES OF CONTRADICTIONS DIFFERING IN NATURE

Never before has our country been as united as it is today. The victories of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and of the socialist revolution and our achievements in socialist construction have rapidly changed the face of the old China. A still brighter future lies ahead for our motherland. The days of national disunity and chaos which the people detested are gone, never to return. Led by the working class and the Communist Party, our 600 million people, united as one, are engaged in the great task of building socialism. The unification of our country, the unity of our people and the unity of our various nationalities — these are the basic guarantees for the sure triumph of our cause. However, this does not mean that contradictions no longer exist in our society. To imagine that none exist is a naive idea which is at variance with objective reality. We are confronted with two types of social contradictions — those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people. The two are totally different in nature.

Speech at the Eleventh Session (Enlarged) of the Supreme State Conference
Comrade Mao Tsetung went over the verbatim record and made certain additions
before its publication in the *People's Daily* on June 19, 1957.

To understand these two different types of contradictions correctly, we must first be clear on what is meant by “the people” and what is meant by “the enemy”. The concept of “the people” varies in content in different countries and in different periods of history in a given country. Take our own country for example. During the War of Resistance Against Japan, all those classes, strata and social groups opposing Japanese aggression came within the category of the people, while the Japanese imperialists, their Chinese collaborators and the pro-Japanese elements were all enemies of the people. During the War of Liberation, the U.S. imperialists and their running dogs — the bureaucrat-capitalists, the landlords and the Kuomintang reactionaries who represented these two classes — were the enemies of the people, while the other classes, strata and social groups, which opposed them, all came within the category of the people. At the present stage, the period of building socialism, the classes, strata and social groups which favour, support and work for the cause of socialist construction all come within the category of the people, while the social forces and groups which resist the socialist revolution and are hostile to or sabotage socialist construction are all enemies of the people.

The contradictions between ourselves and the enemy are antagonistic contradictions. Within the ranks of the people, the contradictions among the working people are non-antagonistic, while those between the exploited and the exploiting classes have a non-antagonistic as well as an antagonistic aspect. There have always been contradictions among the people, but they are different in content in each period of the revolution and in the period of building socialism. In the conditions prevailing in China today, the contradictions among the people comprise the contradictions within the working class, the contradictions within the peasantry, the contradictions within the intelligentsia, the contradictions between the working class and the peasantry, the contradictions between the workers and peasants on the one hand and the intellectuals on the other, the contradictions between the working class and other sections of the working people on the one hand and the national bourgeoisie on the other, the contradictions within the national bourgeoisie, and so on. Our People’s Government is one that genuinely represents the people’s interests, it is a government that serves the people. Nevertheless, there are still certain contradictions between this government and the people. These include the contradictions between the interests of the state and the interests of the collective on the one hand and the interests of the individual on the

other, between democracy and centralism, between the leadership and the led, and the contradictions arising from the bureaucratic style of work of some of the state personnel in their relations with the masses. All these are also contradictions among the people. Generally speaking, the fundamental identity of the people's interests underlies the contradictions among the people.

In our country, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie comes under the category of contradictions among the people. By and large, the class struggle between the two is a class struggle within the ranks of the people, because the Chinese national bourgeoisie has a dual character. In the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, it had both a revolutionary and a conciliationist side to its character. In the period of the socialist revolution, exploitation of the working class for profit constitutes one side of the character of the national bourgeoisie, while its support of the Constitution and its willingness to accept socialist transformation constitute the other. The national bourgeoisie differs from the imperialists, the landlords and the bureaucrat-capitalists. The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between exploiter and exploited, and is by nature antagonistic. But in the concrete conditions of China, this antagonistic contradiction between the two classes, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful methods. However, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie will change into a contradiction between ourselves and the enemy if we do not handle it properly and do not follow the policy of uniting with, criticizing and educating the national bourgeoisie, or if the national bourgeoisie does not accept this policy of ours.

Since they are different in nature, the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and the contradictions among the people must be resolved by different methods. To put it briefly, the former entail drawing a clear distinction between ourselves and the enemy, and the latter entail drawing a clear distinction between right and wrong. It is of course true that the distinction between ourselves and the enemy is also one of right and wrong. For example, the question of who is in the right, we or the domestic and foreign reactionaries, the imperialists, the feudalists and bureaucrat-capitalists, is also one of right and wrong, but it is in a different category from questions of right and wrong among the people.

Our state is a people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. What is this dictatorship for? Its first function is internal, namely, to suppress the reactionary classes and elements and those exploiters who resist the socialist revolution, to suppress those who try to wreck our socialist construction, or in other words, to resolve the contradictions between ourselves and the internal enemy. For instance, to arrest, try and sentence certain counter-revolutionaries, and to deprive landlords and bureaucrat-capitalists of their right to vote and their freedom of speech for a certain period of time — all this comes within the scope of our dictatorship. To maintain public order and safeguard the interests of the people, it is necessary to exercise dictatorship as well over thieves, swindlers, murderers, arsonists, criminal gangs and other scoundrels who seriously disrupt public order. The second function of this dictatorship is to protect our country from subversion and possible aggression by external enemies. In such contingencies, it is the task of this dictatorship to resolve the contradiction between ourselves and the external enemy. The aim of this dictatorship is to protect all our people so that they can devote themselves to peaceful labour and make China a socialist country with modern industry, modern agriculture, and modern science and culture. Who is to exercise this dictatorship? Naturally, the working class and the entire people under its leadership. Dictatorship does not apply within the ranks of the people. The people cannot exercise dictatorship over themselves, nor must one section of the people oppress another. Law-breakers among the people will be punished according to law, but this is different in principle from the exercise of dictatorship to suppress enemies of the people. What applies among the people is democratic centralism. Our Constitution lays it down that citizens of the People's Republic of China enjoy freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, procession, demonstration, religious belief, and so on. Our Constitution also provides that the organs of state must practise democratic centralism, that they must rely on the masses and that their personnel must serve the people. Our socialist democracy is the broadest kind of democracy, such as is not to be found in any bourgeois state. Our dictatorship is the people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. That is to say, democracy operates within the ranks of the people, while the working class, uniting with all others enjoying civil rights, and in the first place with the peasantry,

enforces dictatorship over the reactionary classes and elements and all those who resist socialist transformation and oppose socialist construction. By civil rights, we mean, politically, the rights of freedom and democracy.

But this freedom is freedom with leadership and this democracy is democracy under centralized guidance, not anarchy. Anarchy does not accord with the interests or wishes of the people.

Certain people in our country were delighted by the Hungarian incident. They hoped that something similar would happen in China, that thousands upon thousands of people would take to the streets to demonstrate against the People's Government. Their hopes ran counter to the interests of the masses and therefore could not possibly win their support. Deceived by domestic and foreign counter-revolutionaries, a section of the people in Hungary made the mistake of resorting to violence against the people's government, with the result that both the state and the people suffered. The damage done to the country's economy in a few weeks of rioting will take a long time to repair. In our country there were some others who wavered on the question of the Hungarian incident because they were ignorant of the real state of affairs in the world. They think that there is too little freedom under our people's democracy and that there is more freedom under Western parliamentary democracy. They ask for a two-party system as in the West, with one party in office and the other in opposition. But this so-called two-party system is nothing but a device for maintaining the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; it can never guarantee freedoms to the working people. As a matter of fact, freedom and democracy exist not in the abstract, but only in the concrete. In a society where class struggle exists, if there is freedom for the exploiting classes to exploit the working people, there is no freedom for the working people not to be exploited. If there is democracy for the bourgeoisie, there is no democracy for the proletariat and other working people. The legal existence of the Communist Party is tolerated in some capitalist countries, but only to the extent that it does not endanger the fundamental interests of the bourgeoisie; it is not tolerated beyond that. Those who demand freedom and democracy in the abstract regard democracy as an end and not as a means. Democracy as such sometimes seems to be an end, but it is in fact only a means. Marxism teaches us that democracy is part of the superstructure and belongs to the realm of politics. That is to say, in the last analysis, it serves the economic base. The same is true

of freedom. Both democracy and freedom are relative, not absolute, and they come into being and develop in specific historical conditions. Within the ranks of the people, democracy is correlative with centralism and freedom with discipline. They are the two opposites of a single entity, contradictory as well as united, and we should not one-sidedly emphasize one to the exclusion of the other. Within the ranks of the people, we cannot do without freedom, nor can we do without discipline; we cannot do without democracy, nor can we do without centralism. This unity of democracy and centralism, of freedom and discipline, constitutes our democratic centralism. Under this system, the people enjoy broad democracy and freedom, but at the same time they have to keep within the bounds of socialist discipline. All this is well understood by the masses.

In advocating freedom with leadership and democracy under centralized guidance, we in no way mean that coercive measures should be taken to settle ideological questions or questions involving the distinction between right and wrong among the people. All attempts to use administrative orders or coercive measures to settle ideological questions or questions of right and wrong are not only ineffective but harmful. We cannot abolish religion by administrative order or force people not to believe in it. We cannot compel people to give up idealism, any more than we can force them to embrace Marxism. The only way to settle questions of an ideological nature or controversial issues among the people is by the democratic method, the method of discussion, criticism, persuasion and education, and not by the method of coercion or repression. To be able to carry on their production and studies effectively and to lead their lives in peace and order, the people want their government and those in charge of production and of cultural and educational organizations to issue appropriate administrative regulations of an obligatory nature. It is common sense that without them the maintenance of public order would be impossible. Administrative regulations and the method of persuasion and education complement each other in resolving contradictions among the people. In fact, administrative regulations for the maintenance of public order must be accompanied by persuasion and education, for in many cases regulations alone will not work.

This democratic method of resolving contradictions among the people was epitomized in 1942 in the formula "unity — criticism — unity". To elaborate, that means starting from the desire for unity, resolving contradictions through criticism or struggle, and arriving at

a new unity on a new basis. In our experience this is the correct method of resolving contradictions among the people. In 1942 we used it to resolve contradictions inside the Communist Party, namely, the contradictions between the dogmatists and the great majority of the membership, and between dogmatism and Marxism. The “Left” dogmatists had resorted to the method of “ruthless struggle and merciless blows” in inner-Party struggle. It was the wrong method. In criticizing “Left” dogmatism, we did not use this old method but adopted a new one, that is, one of starting from the desire for unity, distinguishing between right and wrong through criticism or struggle, and arriving at a new unity on a new basis. This was the method used in the rectification movement of 1942. Within a few years, by the time the Chinese Communist Party held its Seventh National Congress in 1945, unity was achieved throughout the Party as anticipated, and consequently the people’s revolution triumphed. Here, the essential thing is to start from the desire for unity. For without this desire for unity, the struggle, once begun, is certain to throw things into confusion and get out of hand. Wouldn’t this be the same as “ruthless struggle and merciless blows”? And what Party unity would there be left? It was precisely this experience that led us to the formula “unity — criticism — unity”. Or, in other words, “learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones and cure the sickness to save the patient”. We extended this method beyond our Party. We applied it with great success in the anti-Japanese base areas in dealing with the relations between the leadership and the masses, between the army and the people, between officers and men, between the different units of the army, and between the different groups of cadres. The use of this method can be traced back to still earlier times in our Party’s history. Ever since 1927 when we built our revolutionary armed forces and base areas in the south, this method had been used to deal with the relations between the Party and the masses, between the army and the people, between officers and men, and with other relations among the people. The only difference was that during the anti-Japanese war we employed this method much more consciously. And since the liberation of the whole country, we have employed this same method of “unity — criticism — unity” in our relations with the democratic parties and with industrial and commercial circles. Our task now is to continue to extend and make still better use of this method throughout the ranks of the people; we want all our factories, co-operatives, shops,

schools, offices and people's organizations, in a word, all our 600 million people, to use it in resolving contradictions among themselves.

In ordinary circumstances, contradictions among the people are not antagonistic. But if they are not handled properly, or if we relax our vigilance and lower our guard, antagonism may arise. In a socialist country, a development of this kind is usually only a localized and temporary phenomenon. The reason is that the system of exploitation of man by man has been abolished and the interests of the people are fundamentally identical. The antagonistic actions which took place on a fairly wide scale during the Hungarian incident were the result of the operations of both domestic and foreign counter-revolutionary elements. This was a particular as well as a temporary phenomenon. It was a case of the reactionaries inside a socialist country, in league with the imperialists, attempting to achieve their conspiratorial aims by taking advantage of contradictions among the people to foment dissension and stir up disorder. The lesson of the Hungarian incident merits attention.

Many people seem to think that the use of the democratic method to resolve contradictions among the people is something new. Actually it is not. Marxists have always held that the cause of the proletariat must depend on the masses of the people and that Communists must use the democratic method of persuasion and education when working among the labouring people and must on no account resort to commandism or coercion. The Chinese Communist Party faithfully adheres to this Marxist-Leninist principle. It has been our consistent view that under the people's democratic dictatorship two different methods, one dictatorial and the other democratic, should be used to resolve the two types of contradictions which differ in nature — those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people. This idea has been explained again and again in many Party documents and in speeches by many leading comrades of our Party. In my article "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship", written in 1949, I said, "The combination of these two aspects, democracy for the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, is the people's democratic dictatorship." I also pointed out that in order to settle problems within the ranks of the people "the method we employ is democratic, the method of persuasion, not of compulsion". Again, in addressing the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference in June 1950, I said:

The people's democratic dictatorship uses two methods. Towards the enemy, it uses the method of dictatorship, that is, for as long a period of time as is necessary it does not permit them to take part in political activity and compels them to obey the law of the People's Government, to engage in labour and, through such labour, be transformed into new men. Towards the people, on the contrary, it uses the method of democracy and not of compulsion, that is, it must necessarily let them take part in political activity and does not compel them to do this or that but uses the method of democracy to educate and persuade. Such education is self-education for the people, and its basic method is criticism and self-criticism.

Thus, on many occasions we have discussed the use of the democratic method for resolving contradictions among the people; furthermore, we have in the main applied it in our work, and many cadres and many other people are familiar with it in practice. Why then do some people now feel that it is a new issue? Because, in the past, the struggle between ourselves and the enemy, both internal and external, was most acute, and contradictions among the people therefore did not attract as much attention as they do today.

Quite a few people fail to make a clear distinction between these two different types of contradictions — those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people — and are prone to confuse the two. It must be admitted that it is sometimes quite easy to do so. We have had instances of such confusion in our work in the past. In the course of cleaning out counter-revolutionaries good people were sometimes mistaken for bad, and such things still happen today. We are able to keep mistakes within bounds because it has been our policy to draw a sharp line between ourselves and the enemy and to rectify mistakes whenever discovered.

Marxist philosophy holds that the law of the unity of opposites is the fundamental law of the universe. This law operates universally, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in man's thinking. Between the opposites in a contradiction there is at once unity and struggle, and it is this that impels things to move and change. Contradictions exist everywhere, but their nature differs in accordance with the different nature of different things. In any given thing, the unity of opposites is conditional, temporary and transitory, and hence relative, whereas the struggle of opposites is absolute. Lenin gave a

very clear exposition of this law. It has come to be understood by a growing number of people in our country. But for many people it is one thing to accept this law and quite another to apply it in examining and dealing with problems. Many dare not openly admit that contradictions still exist among the people of our country, while it is precisely these contradictions that are pushing our society forward. Many do not admit that contradictions still exist in socialist society, with the result that they become irresolute and passive when confronted with social contradictions; they do not understand that socialist society grows more united and consolidated through the ceaseless process of correctly handling and resolving contradictions. For this reason, we need to explain things to our people, and to our cadres in the first place, in order to help them understand the contradictions in socialist society and learn to use correct methods for handling them.

Contradictions in socialist society are fundamentally different from those in the old societies, such as capitalist society. In capitalist society contradictions find expression in acute antagonisms and conflicts, in sharp class struggle; they cannot be resolved by the capitalist system itself and can only be resolved by socialist revolution. The case is quite different with contradictions in socialist society; on the contrary, they are not antagonistic and can be ceaselessly resolved by the socialist system itself.

In socialist society the basic contradictions are still those between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base. However, they are fundamentally different in character and have different features from the contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base in the old societies. The present social system of our country is far superior to that of the old days. If it were not so, the old system would not have been overthrown and the new system could not have been established. In saying that the socialist relations of production correspond better to the character of the productive forces than did the old relations of production, we mean that they allow the productive forces to develop at a speed unattainable in the old society, so that production can expand steadily and increasingly meet the constantly growing needs of the people. Under the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, the productive forces of the old China grew very slowly. For more than fifty years before liberation, China produced only a few tens of thousands of tons of steel a year, not counting the

output of the northeastern provinces. If these provinces are included the peak annual steel output only amounted to a little over 900,000 tons. In 1949, the national steel output was a little over 100,000 tons. Yet now, a mere seven years after the liberation of our country, steel output already exceeds 4,000,000 tons. In the old China, there was hardly any machine-building industry, to say nothing of the automobile and aircraft industries; now we have all three. When the people overthrew the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, many were not clear as to which way China should head — towards capitalism or towards socialism. Facts have now provided the answer: Only socialism can save China. The socialist system has promoted the rapid development of the productive forces of our country, a fact even our enemies abroad have had to acknowledge.

But our socialist system has only just been set up; it is not yet fully established or fully consolidated. In joint state-private industrial and commercial enterprises, capitalists still get a fixed rate of interest on their capital, that is to say, exploitation still exists. So far as ownership is concerned, these enterprises are not yet completely socialist in nature. A number of our agricultural and handicraft producers' co-operatives are still semi-socialist, while even in the fully socialist co-operatives certain specific problems of ownership remain to be solved. Relations between production and exchange in accordance with socialist principles are being gradually established within and between all branches of our economy, and more and more appropriate forms are being sought. The problem of the proper relation of accumulation to consumption within each of the two sectors of the socialist economy — the one where the means of production are owned by the whole people and the other where the means of production are owned by the collective — and the problem of the proper relation of accumulation to consumption between the two sectors themselves are complicated problems for which it is not easy to work out a perfectly rational solution all at once. To sum up, socialist relations of production have been established and are in correspondence with the growth of the productive forces, but these relations are still far from perfect, and this imperfection stands in contradiction to the growth of the productive forces. Apart from correspondence as well as contradiction between the relations of production and the growth of the productive forces, there is correspondence as well as contradiction between the superstructure and the economic base. The superstructure, comprising the state system and laws of the people's

democratic dictatorship and the socialist ideology guided by Marxism-Leninism, plays a positive role in facilitating the victory of socialist transformation and the socialist way of organizing labour; it is in correspondence with the socialist economic base, that is, with socialist relations of production. But the existence of bourgeois ideology, a certain bureaucratic style of work in our state organs and defects in some of the links in our state institutions are in contradiction with the socialist economic base. We must continue to resolve all such contradictions in the light of our specific conditions. Of course, new problems will emerge as these contradictions are resolved. And further efforts will be required to resolve the new contradictions. For instance, a constant process of readjustment through state planning is needed to deal with the contradiction between production and the needs of society, which will long remain an objective reality. Every year our country draws up an economic plan in order to establish a proper ratio between accumulation and consumption and achieve an equilibrium between production and needs. Equilibrium is nothing but a temporary, relative, unity of opposites. By the end of each year, this equilibrium, taken as a whole, is upset by the struggle of opposites; the unity undergoes a change, equilibrium becomes disequilibrium, unity becomes disunity, and once again it is necessary to work out an equilibrium and unity for the next year. Herein lies the superiority of our planned economy. As a matter of fact, this equilibrium, this unity, is partially upset every month or every quarter, and partial readjustments are called for. Sometimes, contradictions arise and the equilibrium is upset because our subjective arrangements do not conform to objective reality; this is what we call making a mistake. The ceaseless emergence and ceaseless resolution of contradictions constitute the dialectical law of the development of things.

Today, matters stand as follows. The large-scale, turbulent class struggles of the masses characteristic of times of revolution have in the main come to an end, but class struggle is by no means entirely over. While welcoming the new system, the masses are not yet quite accustomed to it. Government personnel are not sufficiently experienced and have to undertake further study and investigation of specific policies. In other words, time is needed for our socialist system to become established and consolidated, for the masses to become accustomed to the new system, and for government personnel to learn and acquire experience. It is therefore imperative for us at this juncture to raise the question of distinguishing contradictions among the people

from those between ourselves and the enemy, as well as the question of the correct handling of contradictions among the people, in order to unite the people of all nationalities in our country for the new battle, the battle against nature, develop our economy and culture, help the whole nation to traverse this period of transition relatively smoothly, consolidate our new system and build up our new state.

II. THE QUESTION OF ELIMINATING COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES

The elimination of counter-revolutionaries is a struggle of opposites as between ourselves and the enemy. Among the people, there are some who see this question in a somewhat different light. Two kinds of people hold views differing from ours. Those with a Right deviation in their thinking make no distinction between ourselves and the enemy and take the enemy for our own people. They regard as friends the very persons whom the masses regard as enemies. Those with a "Left" deviation in their thinking magnify contradictions between ourselves and the enemy to such an extent that they take certain contradictions among the people for contradictions with the enemy and regard as counter-revolutionaries persons who are actually not. Both these views are wrong. Neither makes possible the correct handling of the problem of eliminating counter-revolutionaries or a correct assessment of this work.

To form a correct evaluation of our work in eliminating counter-revolutionaries, let us see what repercussions the Hungarian incident has had in China. After its occurrence there was some unrest among a section of our intellectuals, but there were no squalls. Why? One reason, it must be said, was our success in eliminating counter-revolutionaries fairly thoroughly.

Of course, the consolidation of our state is not due primarily to the elimination of counter-revolutionaries. It is due primarily to the fact that we have a Communist Party and a Liberation Army both tempered in decades of revolutionary struggle, and a working people likewise so tempered. Our Party and our armed forces are rooted in the masses, have been tempered in the flames of a protracted revolution and have the capacity to fight. Our People's Republic was not built overnight, but developed step by step out of the revolutionary base areas. A number

of democratic personages have also been tempered in the struggle in varying degrees, and they have gone through troubled times together with us. Some intellectuals were tempered in the struggles against imperialism and reaction; since liberation many have gone through a process of ideological remoulding aimed at enabling them to distinguish clearly between ourselves and the enemy. In addition, the consolidation of our state is due to the fact that our economic measures are basically sound, that the people's life is secure and steadily improving, that our policies towards the national bourgeoisie and other classes are correct, and so on. Nevertheless, our success in eliminating counter-revolutionaries is undoubtedly an important reason for the consolidation of our state. For all these reasons, with few exceptions our college students are patriotic and support socialism and did not give way to unrest during the Hungarian incident, even though many of them come from families of non-working people. The same was true of the national bourgeoisie, to say nothing of the basic masses — the workers and peasants.

After liberation, we rooted out a number of counter-revolutionaries. Some were sentenced to death for major crimes. This was absolutely necessary, it was the demand of the masses, and it was done to free them from long years of oppression by the counter-revolutionaries and all kinds of local tyrants, in other words, to liberate the productive forces. If we had not done so, the masses would not have been able to lift their heads. Since 1956, however, there has been a radical change in the situation. In the country as a whole, the bulk of the counter-revolutionaries have been cleared out. Our basic task has changed from unfettering the productive forces to protecting and expanding them in the context of the new relations of production. Because of failure to understand that our present policy fits the present situation and our past policy fitted the past situation, some people want to make use of the present policy to reverse past decisions and to negate the tremendous success we achieved in eliminating counter-revolutionaries. This is completely wrong, and the masses will not permit it.

In our work of eliminating counter-revolutionaries successes were the main thing, but there were also mistakes. In some cases there were excesses and in others counter-revolutionaries slipped through our net. Our policy is: "Counter-revolutionaries must be eliminated wherever found, mistakes must be corrected whenever discovered." Our line in the work of eliminating counter-revolutionaries is the

mass line. Of course, even with the mass line mistakes may still occur, but they will be fewer and easier to correct. The masses gain experience through struggle. From the things done correctly they gain the experience of how things are done correctly. From the mistakes made they gain the experience of how mistakes are made.

Wherever mistakes have been discovered in the work of eliminating counter-revolutionaries, steps have been or are being taken to correct them. Those not yet discovered will be corrected as soon as they come to light. Exoneration or rehabilitation should be made known as widely as were the original wrong decisions. I propose that a comprehensive review of the work of eliminating counter-revolutionaries be made this year or next to sum up experience, promote justice and counter unjust attacks. Nationally, this review should be in the charge of the Standing Committees of the National People's Congress and of the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference and, locally, in the charge of the people's councils and the committees of the Political Consultative Conference in the provinces and municipalities. In this review, we must help the large numbers of cadres and activists involved in the work, and not pour cold water on them. It would not be right to dampen their spirits. Nonetheless, wrongs must be righted when discovered. This must be the attitude of all the public security organs, the procurators' offices and the judicial departments, prisons and agencies charged with the reform of criminals through labour. We hope that wherever possible members of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, members of the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference and people's deputies will take part in this review. This will be of help in perfecting our legal system and in dealing correctly with counter-revolutionaries and other criminals.

The present situation with regard to counter-revolutionaries can be described in these words: There still are counter-revolutionaries, but not many. In the first place, there still are counter-revolutionaries. Some people say that there aren't any more left and all is well and that we can therefore lay our heads on our pillows and just drop off to sleep. But this is not the way things are. The fact is, there still are counter-revolutionaries (of course, that is not to say you'll find them everywhere and in every organization), and we must continue to fight them. It must be understood that the hidden counter-revolutionaries still at large will not take things lying down, but will certainly seize every opportunity to make trouble. The U.S. imperialists and the Chiang

Kai-shek clique are constantly sending in secret agents to carry on disruptive activities. Even after all the existing counter-revolutionaries have been combed out, new ones are likely to emerge. If we drop our guard, we shall be badly fooled and shall suffer severely. Counter-revolutionaries must be rooted out with a firm hand wherever they are found making trouble. But, taking the country as a whole, there are certainly not many counter-revolutionaries. It would be wrong to say that there are still large numbers of counter-revolutionaries in China. Acceptance of that view would likewise result in a mess.

III. THE QUESTION OF THE CO-OPERATIVE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE

We have a rural population of over 500 million, so how our peasants fare has a most important bearing on the development of our economy and the consolidation of our state power. In my view, the situation is basically sound. The co-operative transformation of agriculture has been successfully accomplished, and this has resolved the great contradiction in our country between socialist industrialization and the individual peasant economy. As the co-operative transformation of agriculture was completed so rapidly, some people were worried and wondered whether something untoward might occur. There are indeed some faults, but fortunately they are not serious and on the whole the movement is healthy. The peasants are working with a will, and last year there was an increase in the country's grain output despite the worst floods, droughts and gales in years. Now there are people who are stirring up a miniature typhoon, they are saying that co-operation is no good, that there is nothing superior about it. Is co-operation superior or not? Among the documents distributed at today's meeting there is one about the Wang Kuo-fan Co-operative in Tsunhua County, Hopei Province, which I suggest you read. This co-operative is situated in a hilly region which was very poor in the past and which for a number of years depended on relief grain from the People's Government. When the co-operative was first set up in 1953, people called it the "paupers' co-op". But it has become better off year by year, and now, after four years of hard struggle, most of its households have reserves of grain. What was possible for this co-operative should also be possible for others to achieve under normal conditions in the same length of time or

a little longer. Clearly there are no grounds for saying that something has gone wrong with agricultural co-operation.

It is also clear that it takes hard struggle to build co-operatives. New things always have to experience difficulties and setbacks as they grow. It is sheer fantasy to imagine that the cause of socialism is all plain sailing and easy success, with no difficulties and setbacks, or without the exertion of tremendous efforts.

Who are the active supporters of the co-operatives? The overwhelming majority of the poor and lower-middle peasants who constitute more than 70 per cent of the rural population. Most of the other peasants are also placing their hopes on the co-operatives. Only a very small minority are really dissatisfied. Quite a number of persons have failed to analyse this situation and to make an over-all examination of the achievements and shortcomings of the co-operatives and the causes of these shortcomings; instead they have taken part of the picture or one side of the matter for the whole, and consequently a miniature typhoon has been stirred up among some people, who are saying that the co-operatives are not superior.

How long will it take to consolidate the co-operatives and for this talk about their not being superior to wind up? Judging from the experience of the growth of many co-operatives, it will probably take five years or a little longer. As most of our co-operatives are only a little over a year old, it would be unreasonable to ask too much of them. In my view, we will be doing well enough if the co-operatives can be consolidated during the Second Five-Year Plan after being established in the First.

The co-operatives are now in the process of gradual consolidation. There are certain contradictions that remain to be resolved, such as those between the state and the co-operatives and those in and between the co-operatives themselves.

To resolve these contradictions we must pay constant attention to the problems of production and distribution. On the question of production, the co-operative economy must be subject to the unified economic planning of the state, while retaining a certain flexibility and independence that do not run counter to the state's unified plan or its policies, laws and regulations. At the same time, every household in a co-operative must comply with the over-all plan of the co-operative or production team to which it belongs, though it may make its own appropriate plans in regard to land allotted for personal needs and to other individually operated economic undertakings. On the question

of distribution, we must take the interests of the state, the collective and the individual into account. We must properly handle the three-way relationship between the state agricultural tax, the co-operative's accumulation fund and the peasants' personal income, and take constant care to make readjustments so as to resolve contradictions between them. Accumulation is essential for both the state and the co-operative but in neither case should it be excessive. We should do everything possible to enable the peasants in normal years to raise their personal incomes annually through increased production.

Many people say that the peasants lead a hard life. Is this true? In one sense it is. That is to say, because the imperialists and their agents oppressed and exploited us for over a century, ours is an impoverished country and the standard of living not only of our peasants but of our workers and intellectuals is still low. We will need several decades of strenuous effort gradually to raise the standard of living of our people as a whole. In this context, it is right to say that the peasants lead a "hard life". But in another sense it is not true. We refer to the allegation that in the seven years since liberation it is only the life of the workers that has been improved and not that of the peasants. As a matter of fact, with very few exceptions, there has been some improvement in the life of both the peasants and the workers. Since liberation, the peasants have been free from landlord exploitation and their production has increased annually. Take grain crops. In 1949, the country's output was only something over 210,000 million catties. By 1956, it had risen to more than 360,000 million catties, an increase of nearly 150,000 million catties. The state agricultural tax is not heavy, only amounting to something over 30,000 million catties a year. State purchases of grain from the peasants at standard prices only amount to a little over 50,000 million catties a year. These two items together total over 80,000 million catties. Furthermore, more than half this grain is sold back to the villages and nearby towns. Obviously, no one can say that there has been no improvement in the life of the peasants. In order to help agriculture to develop and the co-operatives to become consolidated, we are planning to stabilize the total annual amount of the grain tax plus the grain purchased by the state at somewhat more than 80,000 million catties within a few years. In this way, the small number of grain-deficient households still found in the countryside will stop being short, all peasant households, except some raising industrial crops, will either have grain reserves or at least become self-sufficient, there will no longer be poor peasants in the countryside, and the

standard of living of the entire peasantry will reach or surpass the middle peasants' level. It is not right simply to compare a peasant's average annual income with a worker's and jump to the conclusion that one is too low and the other too high. Since the labour productivity of the workers is much higher than that of the peasants and the latter's cost of living is much lower than that of workers in the cities, the workers cannot be said to have received special favours from the state. The wages of a small number of workers and some state personnel are in fact a little too high, the peasants have reason to be dissatisfied with this, and it is necessary to make certain appropriate adjustments according to specific circumstances.

IV. THE QUESTION OF THE INDUSTRIALISTS AND BUSINESSMEN

With regard to the transformation of our social system, the year 1956 saw the conversion of privately owned industrial and commercial enterprises into joint state-private enterprises as well as the co-operative transformation of agriculture and handicrafts. The speed and smoothness of this conversion were closely bound up with our treating the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie as a contradiction among the people. Has this class contradiction been completely resolved? No, not yet. That will take a considerable period of time. However, some people say the capitalists have been so remoulded that they are now not very different from the workers and that further remoulding is unnecessary. Others go so far as to say that the capitalists are even better than the workers. Still others ask, if remoulding is necessary, why isn't it necessary for the working class? Are these opinions correct? Of course not.

In the building of a socialist society, everybody needs remoulding — the exploiters and also the working people. Who says it isn't necessary for the working class? Of course, the remoulding of the exploiters is essentially different from that of the working people, and the two must not be confused. The working class remoulds the whole of society in class struggle and in the struggle against nature, and in the process it remoulds itself. It must ceaselessly learn in the course of work, gradually overcome its shortcomings and never stop doing so. Take for example those of us present here. Many of us make some

progress each year, that is to say, we are remoulding ourselves each year. For myself, I used to have all sorts of non-Marxist ideas, and it was only later that I embraced Marxism. I learned a little Marxism from books and took the first steps in remoulding my ideology, but it was mainly through taking part in class struggle over the years that I came to be remoulded. And if I am to make further progress, I must continue to learn, otherwise I shall lag behind. Can the capitalists be so good that they need no more remoulding?

Some people contend that the Chinese bourgeoisie no longer has two sides to its character, but only one side. Is this true? No. While members of the bourgeoisie have become administrative personnel in joint state-private enterprises and are being transformed from exploiters into working people living by their own labour, they still get a fixed rate of interest on their capital in the joint enterprises, that is, they have not yet cut themselves loose from the roots of exploitation. Between them and the working class there is still a considerable gap in ideology, sentiments and habits of life. How can it be said that they no longer have two sides to their character? Even when they stop receiving their fixed interest payments and the "bourgeois" label is removed, they will still need ideological remoulding for quite some time. If, as is alleged, the bourgeoisie no longer has a dual character, then the capitalists will no longer have the task of studying and of remoulding themselves.

It must be said that this view does not tally either with the actual situation of our industrialists and businessmen or with what most of them want. During the past few years, most of them have been willing to study and have made marked progress. As their thorough remoulding can be achieved only in the course of work, they should engage in labour together with the staff and workers in the enterprises and regard these enterprises as the chief places in which to remould themselves. But it is also important for them to change some of their old views through study. Such study should be on a voluntary basis. When they return to the enterprises after being in study groups for some weeks, many industrialists and businessmen find that they have more of a common language with the workers and the representatives of state ownership, and so there are better possibilities for working together. They know from personal experience that it is good for them to keep on studying and remoulding themselves. The idea mentioned above that study and remoulding are not necessary reflects the views

not of the majority of industrialists and businessmen but of only a small number.

V. THE QUESTION OF THE INTELLECTUALS

The contradictions within the ranks of the people in our country also find expression among the intellectuals. The several million intellectuals who worked for the old society have come to serve the new society, and the question that now arises is how they can fit in with the needs of the new society and how we can help them to do so. This, too, is a contradiction among the people.

Most of our intellectuals have made marked progress during the last seven years. They have shown they are in favour of the socialist system. Many are diligently studying Marxism, and some have become communists. The latter, though at present small in number, are steadily increasing. Of course, there are still some intellectuals who are sceptical about socialism or do not approve of it, but they are a minority.

China needs the services of as many intellectuals as possible for the colossal task of building socialism. We should trust those who are really willing to serve the cause of socialism and should radically improve our relations with them and help them solve the problems requiring solution, so that they can give full play to their talents. Many of our comrades are not good at uniting with intellectuals. They are stiff in their attitude towards them, lack respect for their work and interfere in certain scientific and cultural matters where interference is unwarranted. We must do away with all such shortcomings.

Although large numbers of intellectuals have made progress, they should not be complacent. They must continue to remould themselves, gradually shed their bourgeois world outlook and acquire the proletarian, communist world outlook so that they can fully fit in with the needs of the new society and unite with the workers and peasants. The change in world outlook is fundamental, and up to now most of our intellectuals cannot be said to have accomplished it. We hope that they will continue to make progress and that in the course of work and study they will gradually acquire the communist world outlook, grasp Marxism-Leninism and become integrated with the workers and peasants. We hope they will not stop halfway, or, what is worse, slide back, for there will be no future for them in going backwards. Since

our country's social system has changed and the economic base of bourgeois ideology has in the main been destroyed, not only is it imperative for large numbers of our intellectuals to change their world outlook, but it is also possible for them to do so. But a thorough change in world outlook takes a very long time, and we should spare no pains in helping them and must not be impatient. Actually, there are bound to be some who ideologically will always be reluctant to accept Marxism-Leninism and communism. We should not be too exacting in what we demand of them; as long as they comply with the requirements laid down by the state and engage in legitimate pursuits, we should let them have opportunities for suitable work.

Among students and intellectuals there has recently been a falling off in ideological and political work, and some unhealthy tendencies have appeared. Some people seem to think that there is no longer any need to concern themselves with politics or with the future of the motherland and the ideals of mankind. It seems as if Marxism, once all the rage, is currently not so much in fashion. To counter these tendencies, we must strengthen our ideological and political work. Both students and intellectuals should study hard. In addition to the study of their specialized subjects, they must make progress ideologically and politically, which means they should study Marxism, current events and politics. Not to have a correct political orientation is like not having a soul. The ideological remoulding in the past was necessary and has yielded positive results. But it was carried on in a somewhat rough-and-ready fashion and the feelings of some people were hurt — this was not good. We must avoid such shortcomings in future. All departments and organizations should shoulder their responsibilities for ideological and political work. This applies to the Communist Party, the Youth League, government departments in charge of this work, and especially to heads of educational institutions and teachers. Our educational policy must enable everyone who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a worker with both socialist consciousness and culture. We must spread the idea of building our country through diligence and thrift. We must help all our young people to understand that ours is still a very poor country, that we cannot change this situation radically in a short time, and that only through decades of united effort by our younger generation and all our people, working with their own hands, can China be made prosperous and strong. The establishment of our socialist system has opened the road leading to the ideal society of the future, but to

translate this ideal into reality needs hard work. Some of our young people think that everything ought to be perfect once a socialist society is established and that they should be able to enjoy a happy life ready-made, without working for it. This is unrealistic.

VI. THE QUESTION OF THE MINORITY NATIONALITIES

The minority nationalities in our country number more than thirty million. Although they constitute only 6 per cent of the total population, they inhabit extensive regions which comprise 50 to 60 per cent of China's total area. It is thus imperative to foster good relations between the Han people and the minority nationalities. The key to this question lies in overcoming Han chauvinism. At the same time, efforts should also be made to overcome local-nationality chauvinism, wherever it exists among the minority nationalities. Both Han chauvinism and local-nationality chauvinism are harmful to the unity of the nationalities; they represent one kind of contradiction among the people which should be resolved. We have already done some work to this end. In most of the areas inhabited by minority nationalities, there has been considerable improvement in the relations between the nationalities, but a number of problems remain to be solved. In some areas, both Han chauvinism and local-nationality chauvinism still exist to a serious degree, and this demands full attention. As a result of the efforts of the people of all nationalities over the last few years, democratic reforms and socialist transformation have in the main been completed in most of the minority nationality areas. Democratic reforms have not yet been carried out in Tibet because conditions are not ripe. According to the seventeen-article agreement reached between the Central People's Government and the local government of Tibet, the reform of the social system must be carried out, but the timing can only be decided when the great majority of the people of Tibet and the local leading public figures consider it opportune, and one should not be impatient. It has now been decided not to proceed with democratic reforms in Tibet during the period of the Second Five-Year Plan. Whether to proceed with them in the period of the Third Five-Year Plan can only be decided in the light of the situation at the time.

VII. OVER-ALL CONSIDERATION AND PROPER ARRANGEMENT

By over-all consideration we mean consideration that embraces the 600 million people of our country. In drawing up plans, handling affairs or thinking over problems, we must proceed from the fact that China has a population of 600 million, and we must never forget this fact. Why do we make a point of this? Is it possible that there are people who are still unaware that we have a population of 600 million? Of course, everyone knows this, but when it comes to actual practice, some people forget all about it and act as though the fewer the people, the smaller the circle, the better. Those who have this "small circle" mentality abhor the idea of bringing every positive factor into play, of uniting with everyone who can be united with, and of doing everything possible to turn negative factors into positive ones so as to serve the great cause of building a socialist society. I hope these people will take a wider view and fully recognize that we have a population of 600 million, that this is an objective fact, and that it is an asset for us. Our large population is a good thing, but of course it also involves certain difficulties. Construction is going ahead vigorously on all fronts and very successfully too, but in the present transition period of tremendous social change there are still many difficult problems. Progress and at the same time difficulties — this is a contradiction. However, not only should all such contradictions be resolved, but they definitely can be. Our guiding principle is over-all consideration and proper arrangement. Whatever the problem — whether it concerns food, natural calamities, employment, education, the intellectuals, the united front of all patriotic forces, the minority nationalities, or anything else — we must always proceed from the standpoint of over-all consideration, which embraces the whole people, and must make the proper arrangement, after consultation with all the circles concerned, in the light of what is feasible at a particular time and place. On no account should we complain that there are too many people, that others are backward, that things are troublesome and hard to handle, and close the door on them. Do I mean to say that the government alone must take care of everyone and everything? Of course not. In many cases, they can be left to the direct care of the public organizations or the masses — both are quite capable of devising many good ways of handling them. This also comes

within the scope of the principle of over-all consideration and proper arrangement. We should give guidance on this to the public organizations and the people everywhere.

VIII. ON “LET A HUNDRED FLOWERS BLOSSOM,
LET A HUNDRED SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT CONTEND”
AND “LONG-TERM COEXISTENCE
AND MUTUAL SUPERVISION”

“Let a hundred flowers blossom, let a hundred schools of thought contend” and “long-term coexistence and mutual supervision” — how did these slogans come to be put forward? They were put forward in the light of China’s specific conditions, in recognition of the continued existence of various kinds of contradictions in socialist society and in response to the country’s urgent need to speed up its economic and cultural development. Letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend is the policy for promoting progress in the arts and sciences and a flourishing socialist culture in our land. Different forms and styles in art should develop freely and different schools in science should contend freely. We think that it is harmful to the growth of art and science if administrative measures are used to impose one particular style of art or school of thought and to ban another. Questions of right and wrong in the arts and sciences should be settled through free discussion in artistic and scientific circles and through practical work in these fields. They should not be settled in an over-simple manner. A period of trial is often needed to determine whether something is right or wrong. Throughout history, at the outset new and correct things often failed to win recognition from the majority of people and had to develop by twists and turns through struggle. Often, correct and good things were first regarded not as fragrant flowers but as poisonous weeds. Copernicus’ theory of the solar system and Darwin’s theory of evolution were once dismissed as erroneous and had to win out over bitter opposition. Chinese history offers many similar examples. In a socialist society, the conditions for the growth of the new are radically different from and far superior to those in the old society. Nevertheless, it often happens that new, rising forces are held back and sound ideas stifled. Besides, even in the absence of their deliberate suppression, the growth of new

things may be hindered simply through lack of discernment. It is therefore necessary to be careful about questions of right and wrong in the arts and sciences, to encourage free discussion and avoid hasty conclusions. We believe that such an attitude will help ensure a relatively smooth development of the arts and sciences.

Marxism, too, has developed through struggle. At the beginning, Marxism was subjected to all kinds of attack and regarded as a poisonous weed. This is still the case in many parts of the world. In the socialist countries, it enjoys a different position. But non-Marxist and, what is more, anti-Marxist ideologies exist even in these countries. In China, although socialist transformation has in the main been completed as regards the system of ownership, and although the large-scale, turbulent class struggles of the masses characteristic of times of revolution have in the main come to an end, there are still remnants of the overthrown landlord and comprador classes, there is still a bourgeoisie, and the remoulding of the petty bourgeoisie has only just started. Class struggle is by no means over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the various political forces, and the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the ideological field will still be protracted and tortuous and at times even very sharp. The proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, and so does the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the question of which will win out, socialism or capitalism, is not really settled yet. Marxists remain a minority among the entire population as well as among the intellectuals. Therefore, Marxism must continue to develop through struggle. Marxism can develop only through struggle, and this is not only true of the past and the present, it is necessarily true of the future as well. What is correct invariably develops in the course of struggle with what is wrong. The true, the good and the beautiful always exist by contrast with the false, the evil and the ugly, and grow in struggle with them. As soon as something erroneous is rejected and a particular truth accepted by mankind, new truths begin to struggle with new errors. Such struggles will never end. This is the law of development of truth and, naturally, of Marxism.

It will take a fairly long period of time to decide the issue in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in our country. The reason is that the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals who come from the old society, the very influence which constitutes their class ideology, will persist in our country for a

long time. If this is not understood at all or is insufficiently understood, the gravest of mistakes will be made and the necessity of waging struggle in the ideological field will be ignored. Ideological struggle differs from other forms of struggle, since the only method used is painstaking reasoning, and not crude coercion. Today, socialism is in an advantageous position in the ideological struggle. The basic power of the state is in the hands of the working people led by the proletariat. The Communist Party is strong and its prestige high. Although there are defects and mistakes in our work, every fair-minded person can see that we are loyal to the people, that we are both determined and able to build up our motherland together with them, and that we have already achieved great successes and will achieve still greater ones. The vast majority of the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals who come from the old society are patriotic and are willing to serve their flourishing socialist motherland; they know they will have nothing to fall back on and their future cannot possibly be bright if they turn away from the socialist cause and from the working people led by the Communist Party.

People may ask, since Marxism is accepted as the guiding ideology by the majority of the people in our country, can it be criticized? Certainly it can. Marxism is scientific truth and fears no criticism. If it did, and if it could be overthrown by criticism, it would be worthless. In fact, aren't the idealists criticizing Marxism every day and in every way? And those who harbour bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas and do not wish to change — aren't they also criticizing Marxism in every way? Marxists should not be afraid of criticism from any quarter. Quite the contrary, they need to temper and develop themselves and win new positions in the teeth of criticism and in the storm and stress of struggle. Fighting against wrong ideas is like being vaccinated — a man develops greater immunity from disease as a result of vaccination. Plants raised in hothouses are unlikely to be hardy. Carrying out the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend will not weaken, but strengthen, the leading position of Marxism in the ideological field.

What should our policy be towards non-Marxist ideas? As far as unmistakable counter-revolutionaries and saboteurs of the socialist cause are concerned, the matter is easy, we simply deprive them of their freedom of speech. But incorrect ideas among the people are quite a different matter. Will it do to ban such ideas and deny them any opportunity for expression? Certainly not. It is not only futile but

very harmful to use crude methods in dealing with ideological-questions among the people, with questions about man's mental world.- You may ban the expression of wrong ideas, but the ideas will still be there. On the other hand, if correct ideas are pampered in hothouses and never exposed to the elements and immunized against disease, they will not win out against erroneous ones. Therefore, it is only by employing the method of discussion, criticism and reasoning that we can really foster correct ideas and overcome wrong ones, and that we can really settle issues.

It is inevitable that the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie will give expression to their own ideologies. It is inevitable that they will stubbornly assert themselves on political and ideological questions by every possible means. You cannot expect them to do otherwise. We should not use the method of suppression and prevent them from expressing themselves, but should allow them to do so and at the same time argue with them and direct appropriate criticism at them. Undoubtedly, we must criticize wrong ideas of every description. It certainly would not be right to refrain from criticism, look on while wrong ideas spread unchecked and allow them to dominate the field. Mistakes must be criticized and poisonous weeds fought wherever they crop up. However, such criticism should not be dogmatic, and the metaphysical method should not be used, but instead the effort should be made to apply the dialectical method. What is needed is scientific analysis and convincing argument. Dogmatic criticism settles nothing. We are against poisonous weeds of whatever kind, but we must carefully distinguish between what is really a poisonous weed and what is really a fragrant flower. Together with the masses of the people, we must learn to differentiate carefully between the two and use correct methods to fight the poisonous weeds.

At the same time as we criticize dogmatism, we must direct our attention to criticizing revisionism. Revisionism, or Right opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the Right opportunists, pay lip-service to Marxism; they too attack "dogmatism". But what they are really attacking is the quintessence of Marxism. They oppose or distort materialism and dialectics, oppose or try to weaken the people's democratic dictatorship and the leading role of the Communist Party, and oppose or try to weaken socialist transformation and socialist construction. Even after the basic victory of our socialist revolution, there will still be a number of people in our society who vainly hope

to restore the capitalist system and are sure to fight the working class on every front, including the ideological one. And their right-hand men in this struggle are the revisionists.

Literally the two slogans — let a hundred flowers blossom and let a hundred schools of thought contend — have no class character; the proletariat can turn them to account, and so can the bourgeoisie or others. Different classes, strata and social groups each have their own views on what are fragrant flowers and what are poisonous weeds. Then, from the point of view of the masses, what should be the criteria today for distinguishing fragrant flowers from poisonous weeds? In their political activities, how should our people judge whether a person's words and deeds are right or wrong? On the basis of the principles of our Constitution, the will of the overwhelming majority of our people and the common political positions which have been proclaimed on various occasions by our political parties, we consider that, broadly speaking, the criteria should be as follows:

(1) Words and deeds should help to unite, and not divide, the people of all our nationalities.

(2) They should be beneficial, and not harmful, to socialist transformation and socialist construction.

(3) They should help to consolidate, and not undermine or weaken, the people's democratic dictatorship.

(4) They should help to consolidate, and not undermine or weaken, democratic centralism.

(5) They should help to strengthen, and not shake off or weaken, the leadership of the Communist Party.

(6) They should be beneficial, and not harmful, to international socialist unity and the unity of the peace-loving people of the world.

Of these six criteria, the most important are the two about the socialist path and the leadership of the Party. These criteria are put forward not to hinder but to foster the free discussion of questions among the people. Those who disapprove these criteria can still state their own views and argue their case. However, so long as the majority of the people have clear-cut criteria to go by, criticism and self-criticism can be conducted along proper lines, and these criteria can be applied to people's words and deeds to determine whether they are right or wrong, whether they are fragrant flowers or poisonous weeds. These are political criteria. Naturally, to judge the validity of scientific

theories or assess the aesthetic value of works of art, other relevant criteria are needed. But these six political criteria are applicable to all activities in the arts and sciences. In a socialist country like ours, can there possibly be any useful scientific or artistic activity which runs counter to these political criteria?

The views set out above are based on China's specific historical conditions. Conditions vary in different socialist countries and with different Communist Parties. Therefore, we do not maintain that they should or must adopt the Chinese way.

The slogan "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" is also a product of China's specific historical conditions. It was not put forward all of a sudden, but had been in the making for several years. The idea of long-term coexistence had been there for a long time. When the socialist system was in the main established last year, the slogan was formulated in explicit terms. Why should the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democratic parties be allowed to exist side by side with the party of the working class over a long period of time? Because we have no reason for not adopting the policy of long-term coexistence with all those political parties which are truly devoted to the task of uniting the people for the cause of socialism and which enjoy the trust of the people. As early as June 1950, at the Second Session of the First National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference, I put the matter in this way:

The people and their government have no reason to reject anyone or deny him the opportunity of making a living and rendering service to the country, provided he is really willing to serve the people and provided he really helped and did a good turn when the people were faced with difficulties and keeps on doing good without giving up halfway.

What I was discussing here was the political basis for the long-term coexistence of the various parties. It is the desire as well as the policy of the Communist Party to exist side by side with the democratic parties for a long time to come. But whether the democratic parties can long remain in existence depends not merely on the desire of the Communist Party but on how well they acquit themselves and on whether they enjoy the trust of the people. Mutual supervision among the various parties is also a long-established fact, in the sense that they have long been advising and criticizing each other. Mutual supervision is obviously not a one-sided matter; it means that the

Communist Party can exercise supervision over the democratic parties, and vice versa. Why should the democratic parties be allowed to exercise supervision over the Communist Party? Because a party as much as an individual has great need to hear opinions different from its own. We all know that supervision over the Communist Party is mainly exercised by the working people and the Party membership. But it augments the benefit to us to have supervision by the democratic parties too. Of course, the advice and criticism exchanged by the Communist Party and the democratic parties will play a positive supervisory role only when they conform to the six political criteria given above. Thus, we hope that in order to fit in with the needs of the new society, all the democratic parties will pay attention to ideological remoulding and strive for long-term coexistence with the Communist Party and mutual supervision.

IX. ON THE QUESTION OF DISTURBANCES CREATED BY SMALL NUMBERS OF PEOPLE

In 1956, small numbers of workers or students in certain places went on strike. The immediate cause of these disturbances was the failure to satisfy some of their demands for material benefits, of which some should and could have been met, while others were out of place or excessive and therefore could not be met for the time being. But a more important cause was bureaucracy on the part of the leadership. In some cases, the responsibility for such bureaucratic mistakes fell on the higher authorities, and those at the lower levels were not to blame. Another cause of these disturbances was lack of ideological and political education among the workers and students. The same year, in some agricultural co-operatives there were also disturbances created by a few of their members, and here too the main causes were bureaucracy on the part of the leadership and lack of educational work among the masses.

It should be admitted that among the masses some are prone to pay attention to immediate, partial and personal interests and do not understand, or do not sufficiently understand, long-range, national and collective interests. Because of lack of political and social experience, quite a number of young people cannot readily see the

contrast between the old China and the new, and it is not easy for them thoroughly to comprehend the hardships our people went through in the struggle to free themselves from the oppression of the imperialists and Kuomintang reactionaries, or the long years of hard work needed before a fine socialist society can be established. That is why we must constantly carry on lively and effective political education among the masses and should always tell them the truth about the difficulties that crop up and discuss with them how to surmount these difficulties.

We do not approve of disturbances, because contradictions among the people can be resolved through the method of “unity — criticism — unity”, while disturbances are bound to cause some losses and are not conducive to the advance of socialism. We believe that the masses of the people support socialism, conscientiously observe discipline and are reasonable, and will certainly not take part in disturbances without cause. But this does not mean that the possibility of disturbances by the masses no longer exists in our country. On this question, we should pay attention to the following. (1) In order to root out the causes of disturbances, we must resolutely overcome bureaucracy, greatly improve ideological and political education, and deal with all contradictions properly. If this is done, generally speaking there will be no disturbances. (2) When disturbances do occur as a result of poor work on our part, then we should guide those involved onto the correct path, use the disturbances as a special means for improving our work and educating the cadres and the masses, and find solutions to those problems which were previously left unsolved. In handling any disturbance, we should take pains and not use over-simple methods, or hastily declare the matter closed. The ringleaders in disturbances should not be summarily expelled, except for those who have committed criminal offences or are active counter-revolutionaries and have to be punished by law. In a large country like ours, there is nothing to get alarmed about if small numbers of people create disturbances; on the contrary, such disturbances will help us get rid of bureaucracy.

There are also a small number of individuals in our society who, flouting the public interest, wilfully break the law and commit crimes. They are apt to take advantage of our policies and distort them, and deliberately put forward unreasonable demands in order to incite the masses, or deliberately spread rumours to create trouble and disrupt public order. We do not propose to let these individuals have their way. On the contrary, proper legal action must be taken

against them. Punishing them is the demand of the masses, and it would run counter to the popular will if they were not punished.

X. CAN BAD THINGS BE TURNED INTO GOOD THINGS?

In our society, as I have said, disturbances by the masses are bad, and we do not approve of them. But when disturbances do occur, they enable us to learn lessons, to overcome bureaucracy and to educate the cadres and the masses. In this sense, bad things can be turned into good things. Disturbances thus have a dual character. Every disturbance can be regarded in this way.

Everybody knows that the Hungarian incident was not a good thing. But it too had a dual character. Because our Hungarian comrades took proper action in the course of the incident, what was a bad thing has eventually turned into a good one. Hungary is now more consolidated than ever, and all other countries in the socialist camp have also learned a lesson.

Similarly, the world-wide campaign against communism and the people which took place in the latter half of 1956 was of course a bad thing. But it served to educate and temper the Communist Parties and the working class in all countries, and thus it has turned into a good thing. In the storm and stress of this period, a number of people in many countries withdrew from the Communist Party. Withdrawal from the Party reduces its membership and is, of course, a bad thing. But there is a good side to it, too. Vacillating elements who are unwilling to carry on have withdrawn, and the vast majority who are staunch Party members can be the better united for struggle. Why isn't this a good thing?

To sum up, we must learn to look at problems from all sides, seeing the reverse as well as the obverse side of things. In given conditions, a bad thing can lead to good results and a good thing to bad results. More than two thousand years ago Lao Tzu said: "Good fortune lieth within bad, bad fortune lurketh within good."¹ When the Japanese shot their way into China, they called this a victory. Huge parts of China's territory were seized, and the Chinese called this a defeat. But victory was conceived in China's defeat, while defeat was conceived in Japan's victory. Hasn't history proved this true?

People all over the world are now discussing whether or not a third world war will break out. On this question, too, we must be mentally prepared and do some analysis. We stand firmly for peace and against war. But if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude towards any disturbance: first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it. The First World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will completely collapse.

In given conditions, each of the two opposing aspects of a contradiction invariably transforms itself into its opposite as a result of the struggle between them. Here, it is the conditions which are essential. Without the given conditions, neither of the two contradictory aspects can transform itself into its opposite. Of all the classes in the world the proletariat is the one which is most eager to change its position, and next comes the semi-proletariat, for the former possesses nothing at all while the latter is hardly any better off. The United States now controls a majority in the United Nations and dominates many parts of the world — this state of affairs is temporary and will be changed one of these days. China's position as a poor country denied its rights in international affairs will also be changed — the poor country will change into a rich one, the country denied its rights into one enjoying them — a transformation of things into their opposites. Here, the decisive conditions are the socialist system and the concerted efforts of a united people.

XI. ON PRACTISING ECONOMY

Here I wish to speak briefly on practising economy. We want to carry on large-scale construction, but our country is still very poor — herein lies a contradiction. One way of resolving it is to make a sustained effort to practise strict economy in every field.

During the movement against the “three evils” in 1952, we fought against corruption, waste and bureaucracy, with the emphasis on combating corruption. In 1955 we advocated the practice of economy with great success, our emphasis then being on combating the unduly high standards for non-productive projects in capital construction and economizing on raw materials in industrial production. But at that time economy was not yet applied in earnest as a guiding principle in all branches of the national economy, or in government offices, army units, schools and people’s organizations in general. This year we are calling for economy and the elimination of waste in every sphere throughout the country. We still lack experience in the work of construction. During the last few years, great successes have been achieved, but there has also been waste. We must build up a number of large-scale modern enterprises step by step to form the mainstay of our industry, without which we shall not be able to turn China into a powerful modern industrial country within the coming decades. But the majority of our enterprises should not be built on such a scale; we should set up more small and medium enterprises and make full use of the industrial base inherited from the old society, so as to effect the greatest economy and do more with less money. Good results have begun to appear in the few months since the principle of practising strict economy and combating waste was put forward, in more emphatic terms than before, by the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in November 1956. The present campaign for economy must be conducted in a thorough and sustained way. Like the criticism of any other fault or mistake, the fight against waste may be compared to washing one’s face. Don’t people wash their faces every day? The Chinese Communist Party, the democratic parties, the democrats with no party affiliation, the intellectuals, industrialists and businessmen, workers, peasants and handicraftsmen — in short, all our 600 million people — must strive for increased production and economy, and against extravagance and waste. This is of prime importance not only economically, but politically as well. A dangerous tendency has shown itself of late among many of our personnel — an unwillingness to share weal and woe with the masses, a concern for personal fame and gain. This is very bad. One way of overcoming it is to streamline our organizations in the course of our campaign to increase production and practise economy, and to transfer cadres to lower levels so that a considerable number will return to productive work. We must see to it

that all our cadres and all our people constantly bear in mind that ours is a large socialist country but an economically backward and poor one, and that this is a very big contradiction. To make China prosperous and strong needs several decades of hard struggle, which means, among other things, pursuing the policy of building up our country through diligence and thrift, that is, practising strict economy and fighting waste.

XII. CHINA'S PATH TO INDUSTRIALIZATION

In discussing our path to industrialization, we are here concerned principally with the relationship between the growth of heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. It must be affirmed that heavy industry is the core of China's economic construction. At the same time, full attention must be paid to the development of agriculture and light industry.

As China is a large agricultural country, with over 80 per cent of its population in the rural areas, agriculture must develop along with industry, for only thus can industry secure raw materials and a market, and only thus is it possible to accumulate more funds for building a powerful heavy industry. Everyone knows that light industry is closely tied up with agriculture. Without agriculture there can be no light industry. But it is not yet so clearly understood that agriculture provides heavy industry with an important market. This fact, however, will be more readily appreciated as gradual progress in the technical transformation and modernization of agriculture calls for more and more machinery, fertilizer, water conservancy and electric power projects and transport facilities for the farms, as well as fuel and building materials for the rural consumers. During the period of the Second and Third Five-Year Plans, the entire national economy will benefit if we can achieve an even greater growth in our agriculture and thus induce a correspondingly greater development of light industry. As agriculture and light industry develop, heavy industry, assured of its market and funds, will grow faster. Hence what may seem to be a slower pace of industrialization will actually not be so slow, and indeed may even be faster. In three five-year plans or perhaps a little longer, China's annual steel output can be raised to 20,000,000 tons or more, as compared with the peak pre-liberation output of something over

900,000 tons in 1943. This will gladden the people in both town and country.

I do not propose to dwell on economic questions today. With barely seven years of economic construction behind us, we still lack experience and need to accumulate it. Neither had we any experience in revolution when we first started, and it was only after we had taken a number of tumbles and acquired experience that we won nation-wide victory. What we must now demand of ourselves is to gain experience in economic construction in a shorter period of time than it took us to gain experience in revolution, and not to pay as high a price for it. Some price we will have to pay, but we hope it will not be as high as that paid during the period of revolution. We must realize that there is a contradiction here — the contradiction between the objective laws of economic development of a socialist society and our subjective cognition of them — which needs to be resolved in the course of practice. This contradiction also manifests itself as a contradiction between different people, that is, a contradiction between those in whom the reflection of these objective laws is relatively accurate and those in whom the reflection is relatively inaccurate; this, too, is a contradiction among the people. Every contradiction is an objective reality, and it is our task to reflect it and resolve it in as nearly correct a fashion as we can.

In order to turn China into an industrial country, we must learn conscientiously from the advanced experience of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been building socialism for forty years, and its experience is very valuable to us. Let us ask: Who designed and equipped so many important factories for us? Was it the United States? Or Britain? No, neither the one nor the other. Only the Soviet Union was willing to do so, because it is a socialist country and our ally. In addition to the Soviet Union, the fraternal countries in East Europe have also given us some assistance. It is perfectly true that we should learn from the good experience of all countries, socialist or capitalist, about this there is no argument. But the main thing is still to learn from the Soviet Union. Now there are two different attitudes towards learning from others. One is the dogmatic attitude of transplanting everything, whether or not it is suited to our conditions. This is no good. The other attitude is to use our heads and learn those things which suit our conditions, that is, to absorb whatever experience is useful to us. That is the attitude we should adopt.

To strengthen our solidarity with the Soviet Union, to strengthen our solidarity with all the socialist countries — this is our fundamental policy, this is where our basic interests lie. Then there are the Asian and African countries and all the peace-loving countries and peoples — we must strengthen and develop our solidarity with them. United with these two forces, we shall not stand alone. As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their people and strive to coexist peacefully with those countries, do business with them and prevent a possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbour any unrealistic notions about them.

NOTES

¹ *Lao Tzu*, Chapter LVIII.

SPEECH AT THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PROPAGANDA WORK

March 12, 1957

Comrades,

This conference has gone very well. Many questions have been raised during the conference and we have learned about many things. I shall now make a few remarks on questions the comrades here have been discussing.

We are living in a period of great social change. Chinese society has been in the midst of great changes for a long time. The War of Resistance Against Japan was one period of great change and the War of Liberation another. But the present changes are much more profound in character than the earlier ones. We are now building socialism. Hundreds of millions of people are taking part in the movement for socialist transformation. Class relations are changing throughout the country. The petty bourgeoisie in agriculture and handicrafts and the bourgeoisie in industry and commerce have both experienced changes. The social and economic system has been changed; individual economy has been transformed into collective economy, and capitalist private ownership is being transformed into socialist public ownership. Changes of such magnitude are of course reflected in people's minds. Man's social being determines his consciousness. These great changes in our social system are reflected differently among people of different classes, strata and social groups. The masses eagerly support them, for life itself has confirmed that socialism is the only way out for China. Overthrowing the old social system and establishing a new one, the system of socialism, means a great struggle, a great change in the social system and in men's relations with each other. It should be said that the situation is basically sound. But the new social system has only

just been established and requires time for its consolidation. It must not be assumed that the new system can be completely consolidated the moment it is established; that is impossible. It has to be consolidated step by step. To achieve its ultimate consolidation, it is necessary not only to bring about the socialist industrialization of the country and persevere in the socialist revolution on the economic front, but also to carry on constant and arduous socialist revolutionary struggles and socialist education on the political and ideological fronts. Moreover, various complementary international conditions are required. In China the struggle to consolidate the socialist system, the struggle to decide whether socialism or capitalism will prevail, will take a long historical period. But we should all realize that the new system of socialism will unquestionably be consolidated. We can assuredly build a socialist state with modern industry, modern agriculture, and modern science and culture. This is the first point I want to make.

Second, the situation regarding the intellectuals in our country. No accurate statistics are available on the number of intellectuals in China. It is estimated that there are about five million of all types, including both higher and ordinary intellectuals. Of these five million the overwhelming majority are patriotic, love our People's Republic, and are willing to serve the people and the socialist state. A small number do not quite welcome the socialist system and are not very happy about it. They are still sceptical about socialism, but they are patriotic when it comes to facing imperialism. The number of intellectuals who are hostile to our state is very small. They do not like our state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and yearn for the old society. Whenever there is an opportunity, they will stir up trouble and attempt to overthrow the Communist Party and restore the old China. As between the proletarian and the bourgeois lines, as between the socialist and the capitalist lines, they stubbornly choose to follow the latter. In fact this line is not practicable, and therefore they are actually ready to capitulate to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism. Such persons are found in political circles and in industrial and commercial, cultural and educational, scientific and technological and religious circles, and they are extremely reactionary. They account for only 1 or 2 or 3 per cent of the five million intellectuals. The overwhelming majority, or well over 90 per cent, of the total of five million, support the socialist system in varying degrees. Many of them are not yet quite clear on how to work under socialism and on how to understand, handle and solve many of the new problems.

As far as the attitude of the five million intellectuals towards Marxism is concerned, one may say that over 10 per cent, comprising the Communists and sympathizers, are relatively familiar with Marxism and take a firm stand — the stand of the proletariat. Among the total of five million, they are a minority, but they are the nucleus and a powerful force. The majority have the desire to study Marxism and have already learned a little, but they are not yet familiar with it. Some of them still have doubts, their stand is not yet firm and they vacillate in moments of stress. This section of intellectuals, constituting the majority of the five million, is still in the middle. Those who strongly oppose Marxism, or are hostile to it, are very few in number. Some actually disagree with Marxism, although they do not openly say so. There will be people like this for a long time to come, and we should allow them to disagree. Take some of the idealists for example. They may support the socialist political and economic system but disagree with the Marxist world outlook. The same holds true for the patriotic people in religious circles. They are theists and we are atheists. We cannot force them to accept the Marxist world outlook. In short, the attitude towards Marxism of the five million intellectuals may be summed up as follows: Those who support Marxism and are relatively familiar with it are a minority, those who oppose it are also a minority, and the majority support Marxism but are not familiar with it and support it in varying degrees. Here there are three different kinds of stand — resolute, wavering and antagonistic. It should be recognized that this situation will continue for a very long time. If we fail to recognize this, we shall make too great a demand on others and at the same time set ourselves too small a task. Our comrades in propaganda work have the task of disseminating Marxism. This has to be done gradually and done well, so that people willingly accept it. We cannot force people to accept Marxism, we can only persuade them. If over a period of several five-year plans a fairly large number of our intellectuals accept Marxism and acquire a fairly good grasp of it through practice, through their work and life, through class struggle, production and scientific activity, that will be fine. And that is what we hope will happen.

Third, the question of the remoulding of the intellectuals. Ours is a culturally underdeveloped country. For a vast country like ours, five million intellectuals are too few. Without intellectuals our work cannot be done well, and we should therefore do a good job of uniting with them. Socialist society mainly comprises three sections of people,

the workers, the peasants and the intellectuals. Intellectuals are mental workers. Their work is in the service of the people, that is, in the service of the workers and the peasants. As far as the majority of the intellectuals are concerned, they can serve the new China as they did the old, serve the proletariat as they did the bourgeoisie. When the intellectuals served the old China, the left wing resisted, the middle wavered, and only the right wing stood firm. Now, when it comes to serving the new society, the reverse is the case. The left wing stands firm, the middle wavers (this wavering in the new society is different from that in the old), and the right wing resists. Moreover, intellectuals are educators. Our newspapers are educating the people every day. Our writers and artists, scientists and technicians, professors and teachers are all educating students, educating the people. Being educators and teachers, they have the duty to be educated first. And all the more so in the present period of great change in the social system. They have had some Marxist education in the last few years, and some have studied very hard and made great progress. But the majority still have a long way to go before they can completely replace their bourgeois world outlook with the proletarian world outlook. Some have read a few Marxist books and think themselves quite learned, but what they have read has not sunk in, has not taken root in their minds, so that they don't know how to use it and their class feelings remain unchanged. Others are conceited; having picked up some book-phrases, they think themselves terrific and are very cocky; but whenever a storm blows up, they take a stand very different from that of the workers and the great majority of the working peasants. They waver while the latter stand firm, they equivocate while the latter are forthright. Hence it is wrong to assume that people who educate others no longer need to be educated themselves and no longer need to study, or that socialist remoulding means remoulding others — the landlords, the capitalists and the individual producers — but not the intellectuals. The intellectuals, too, need remoulding, and not only those who have not changed their basic stand; everybody should study and remould himself. I say "everybody", and that includes all of us present here. Conditions are changing all the time, and to adapt one's thinking to the new conditions, one must study. Even those who have a better grasp of Marxism and are comparatively firm in their proletarian stand have to go on studying, have to absorb what is new and study new problems. Unless they rid their minds of what is unsound, intellectuals cannot shoulder the

task of educating others. Naturally, we have to learn while teaching and be pupils while serving as teachers. To be a good teacher, one must first be a good pupil. There are many things which cannot be learned from books alone; one must learn from those engaged in production, from the workers, from the peasants and, in schools, from the students, from those one teaches. In my opinion, the majority of our intellectuals are willing to learn. Given their willingness, it is our duty sincerely to help them study; we must help them in an appropriate way and must not resort to compulsion and force them to study.

Fourth, the question of the integration of the intellectuals with the masses of workers and peasants. Since they are to serve the masses of workers and peasants, intellectuals must, first and foremost, know them and be familiar with their life, work and ideas. We encourage intellectuals to go among the masses, to go to factories and villages. It is very bad if you never in all your life meet a worker or a peasant. Our state personnel, writers, artists, teachers and scientific research workers should seize every opportunity to get close to the workers and peasants. Some can go to factories or villages just to look around; this may be called "looking at the flowers on horseback" and is better than doing nothing at all. Others can stay for a few months, conducting investigations and making friends; this may be called "dismounting to look at the flowers". Still others can stay and live there for a considerable time, say, two or three years or even longer; this may be called "settling down". Some intellectuals do live among the workers and peasants, for instance, technicians in factories, technical personnel in agriculture and teachers in rural schools. They should do their work well and become one with the workers and peasants. We should make it the common practice to get close to the workers and peasants, in other words, we should have large numbers of intellectuals doing so. Not all of them of course; some are unable to go for one reason or another, but we hope that as many as possible will go. Nor can they all go at the same time; they can go in batches at different times. In the Yen-an days, intellectuals were urged to make direct contact with workers and peasants. Many intellectuals in Yen-an were very confused in their thinking and came forth with all sorts of queer arguments. We held a forum and advised them to go among the masses. Later on, many did, and the results were very good. Until an intellectual's book knowledge is integrated with practice, it is incomplete or indeed very incomplete. It is chiefly through reading books that intellectuals acquire the experience of our predecessors. Of course,

reading books cannot be dispensed with, but by itself it does not solve problems. One must study the actual situation, study practical experience and factual material, and make friends with the workers and peasants. Making friends with the workers and peasants is no easy job. Today also there are people who go to factories or villages, and the results are good in some cases but not in others. What is involved here is the question of stand or attitude, that is, of one's world outlook. We advocate "letting a hundred schools of thought contend", and there may be many schools and trends in every branch of learning, but on the matter of world outlook, there are basically only two schools in our time, the proletarian and the bourgeois. It is one or the other, either the proletarian or the bourgeois world outlook. The communist world outlook is the world outlook of the proletariat and of no other class. Most of our present intellectuals come from the old society and from families of non-working people. Even those who come from workers' or peasants' families are still bourgeois intellectuals, because the education they received before liberation was a bourgeois education and their world outlook is fundamentally bourgeois. If the intellectuals do not discard the old and replace it by the proletarian world outlook, they will remain different from the workers and peasants in their viewpoint, stand and feelings and will be like square pegs in round holes, and the workers and peasants will not open their hearts to them. If the intellectuals integrate themselves with the workers and peasants and make friends with them, the Marxism they have learned from books can become truly their own. In order to have a real grasp of Marxism, one must learn it not only from books, but chiefly through class struggle, through practical work and close contact with the masses of workers and peasants. When in addition to studying some Marxism our intellectuals have gained some understanding of it through close contact with the masses of workers and peasants and through their own practical work, we will all be speaking the same language, not only the common language of patriotism and of the socialist system, but probably even that of the communist world outlook. If that happens, all of us will certainly work much better.

Fifth, rectification. Rectification means correcting one's way of thinking and style of work. Rectification movements were conducted within the Communist Party during the anti-Japanese war, during the War of Liberation, and in the early days after the founding of the People's Republic of China. Now the Central Committee of the Communist Party has decided on another rectification within the Party

to be started this year. Non-Party people may take part or abstain as they wish. The main thing in this rectification movement is to criticize the following incorrect ways of thinking and styles of work — subjectivism, bureaucracy and sectarianism. As in the rectification movement during the anti-Japanese war, the method this time will be first to study a number of documents, and then, on the basis of such study, to examine one's own thinking and work and unfold criticism and self-criticism to expose shortcomings and mistakes and promote what is right and good. On the one hand, we must be strict and conduct criticism and self-criticism with respect to mistakes and shortcomings seriously, not perfunctorily, and correct them; on the other hand, we must use the method of the "gentle breeze and mild rain" and that of "learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient", and we must oppose the method of "finishing people off with a single blow".

Ours is a great Party, a glorious Party, a correct Party. This must be affirmed as a fact. But we still have shortcomings, and this, too, must be affirmed as a fact. We should not affirm everything about ourselves, but only what is correct; at the same time, we should not negate everything about ourselves, but only what is wrong. Achievements are the main thing in our work, and yet there are not a few shortcomings and mistakes. That is why we need a rectification movement. Will it undermine our Party's prestige if we criticize our own subjectivism, bureaucracy and sectarianism? I think not. On the contrary, it will serve to enhance the Party's prestige. This was borne out by the rectification movement during the anti-Japanese war. It enhanced the prestige of our Party, of our Party comrades and our veteran cadres, and it also enabled the new cadres to make great progress. Which of the two was afraid of criticism, the Communist Party or the Kuomintang? The Kuomintang. It prohibited criticism, but that did not save it from final defeat. The Communist Party does not fear criticism because we are Marxists, the truth is on our side, and the basic masses, the workers and peasants, are on our side. As we used to say, the rectification movement is "a widespread movement of Marxist education".¹ Rectification means the whole Party studying Marxism through criticism and self-criticism. We can certainly learn more Marxism in the course of the rectification movement.

The transformation and construction of China depend on us for leadership. When we have rectified our way of thinking and style of work, we shall enjoy greater initiative in our work, become more

capable and do a better job. Our country has need of many people who whole-heartedly serve the masses and the cause of socialism and who are determined to bring about changes. We Communists should all be people of this kind. Formerly, in the old China, it was a crime to talk about reforms, and offenders would be beheaded or imprisoned. Nevertheless there were determined reformers who were dauntless and published books and newspapers, educated and organized the people and waged indomitable struggles under every kind of difficulty. The state, the people's democratic dictatorship, has paved the way for the rapid economic and cultural development of our country. It is only a few years since the establishment of our state, and yet people can already see the unprecedented flowering of the economy, culture, education and science. In building up the new China we Communists are likewise not daunted by any difficulties. But we cannot accomplish this all on our own. We need a good number of non-Party people with high ideals who will keep to the socialist and communist orientation and fight dauntlessly with us to transform and construct our society. It is a colossal task to ensure a better life for the several hundred million people of China and to make our economically and culturally backward country a prosperous and powerful one with a high level of culture. And it is precisely in order to be able to shoulder this task more competently and work better with all non-Party people who have high ideals and the determination to institute reforms that we must conduct rectification movements both now and in the future, and constantly rid ourselves of whatever is wrong. Thoroughgoing materialists are fearless; we hope that all our fellow fighters will courageously shoulder their responsibilities and overcome all difficulties, fearing no setbacks or gibes, nor hesitating to criticize us Communists and give us their suggestions. "He who is not afraid of death by a thousand cuts dares to unhorse the emperor" — this is the dauntless spirit needed in our struggle to build socialism and communism. On our part, we Communists should create conditions helpful to those who co-operate with us, establish good comradely relations with them in our common work and unite with them in our joint struggle.

Sixth, the question of one-sidedness. One-sidedness means thinking in terms of absolutes, that is, taking a metaphysical approach to problems. In the appraisal of our work, it is one-sided to affirm everything or to negate everything. There still are quite a few people inside the Communist Party and many outside it who do just that. To affirm everything is to see only the good and not the bad, and to welcome

only praise and not criticism. To talk as though our work is good in every respect is at variance with the facts. It is not true that everything is good; there are shortcomings and mistakes. But neither is it true that everything is bad; that too is at variance with the facts. Here analysis is necessary. To negate everything is to think, without prior analysis, that nothing has been done well and that the great task of building socialism, the great struggle in which hundreds of millions of people are participating, is a complete mess with nothing commendable about it. Although there is a difference between many of those who hold such views and those who are hostile to the socialist system, these views are very mistaken and harmful and can only dishearten people. It is wrong to appraise our work either from the standpoint of affirming everything or from the standpoint of negating everything. We should criticize those people who take such a one-sided approach to problems, though of course we should do so in the spirit of "learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient", and we should give them help.

Some people say: Since there is to be a rectification movement and since everyone is asked to express his opinions, one-sidedness is unavoidable, and therefore it seems that in calling for the elimination of one-sidedness, you really don't want people to speak up. Is this assertion right? It is naturally difficult for everyone to be free from any trace of one-sidedness. People always examine and handle problems and express their views in the light of their own experience, and unavoidably they sometimes show a little one-sidedness. However, shouldn't we ask them gradually to overcome their one-sidedness and look at problems in a relatively all-sided way? In my opinion, we should. We would be stagnating and we would be approving one-sidedness and contradicting the whole purpose of rectification if we did not make the demand that from day to day and from year to year more and more people should view problems in a relatively all-sided way. One-sidedness violates dialectics. We want gradually to disseminate dialectics and to ask everyone gradually to learn the use of the scientific dialectical method. Some of the articles appearing today are extremely pretentious but empty, without any analysis of problems or reasoned argument, and they carry no conviction. There should be fewer and fewer articles of this kind. When writing an article, one should not be for ever thinking, "How smart I am!" but should put oneself on a completely equal footing with one's readers. You may have been in the revolution for a long time, but if you say something wrong

people will refute you all the same. The more you put on airs, the less people will stand for it and the less they will care to read your articles. We should do our work honestly, take an analytical approach, write convincingly and never strike a pose to overawe people.

Some people say that while one-sidedness can be avoided in a lengthy article, it is unavoidable in a short essay. Must a short essay inevitably be one-sided? As I have just said, it is usually hard to avoid one-sidedness, and there is nothing terrible if it creeps in to a certain extent. Criticism would be hampered if everyone were required to look at problems in an absolutely all-sided way. Nevertheless, we do ask everyone to try to approach problems in a relatively all-sided way and try to avoid one-sidedness not only in long articles but also in short articles, short essays included. Some people argue, how is it possible to undertake analysis in an essay of a few hundred or one to two thousand words? I say, why not? Didn't Lu Hsun do it? The analytical method is dialectical. By analysis, we mean analysing the contradictions in things. And sound analysis is impossible without intimate knowledge of life and without real understanding of the relevant contradictions. Lu Hsun's later essays are so penetrating and powerful and yet so free from one-sidedness precisely because by then he had grasped dialectics. Some of Lenin's articles can also be called short essays; they are satirical and pungent, but without one-sidedness. Almost all of Lu Hsun's essays were directed at the enemy; some of Lenin's essays were directed at the enemy and others at comrades. Can the Lu Hsun type of essay be used against mistakes and shortcomings within the ranks of the people? I think it can. Of course, we must make a distinction between ourselves and the enemy, and we must not adopt an antagonistic stand towards comrades and treat them as we would the enemy. One must speak warmly and sincerely with a desire to protect the cause of the people and raise their political consciousness and must not indulge in ridicule or attack.

What if one dare not write? Some people say they dare not write even when they have something to say, lest they should offend people and be criticized. I think such worries can be cast aside. Ours is a people's democratic state, and it provides an environment conducive to writing in the service of the people. The policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend offers additional guarantees for the flowering of science and the arts. If what you say is right, you need not fear criticism, and through debate you can further explain your correct views. If what you say is wrong, then

criticism can help you correct your mistakes, and there is nothing bad in that. In our society, militant revolutionary criticism and counter-criticism is the healthy method used to expose and resolve contradictions, develop science and the arts and ensure success in all our work.

Seventh, whether to “open wide” or to “restrict”? This is a question of policy. “Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend” is a long-term as well as a fundamental policy; it is not just a temporary policy. In the discussion, comrades expressed disapproval of “restriction”, and I think this view is the correct one. The Central Committee of the Party is of the opinion that we must “open wide”, not “restrict”.

Two alternative methods of leading our country, or in other words two alternative policies, can be adopted — to “open wide” or to “restrict”. To “open wide” means to let all people express their opinions freely, so that they dare to speak, dare to criticize and dare to debate; it means not being afraid of wrong views or anything poisonous; it means to encourage argument and criticism among people holding different views, allowing freedom both for criticism and for counter-criticism; it means not coercing people with wrong views into submission but convincing them by reasoning. To “restrict” means to forbid people to air differing opinions and express wrong ideas, and to “finish them off with a single blow” if they do so. That is the way to aggravate rather than to resolve contradictions. To “open wide”, or to “restrict”? We must choose one or the other of these two policies. We choose the former, because it is the policy which will help to consolidate our country and develop our culture.

We intend to use the policy of “opening wide” to unite with the several million intellectuals and change their present outlook. As I have said above, the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals in our country want to make progress and remould themselves, and they are quite capable of being remoulded. In this connection, the policy we adopt will play a big role. The question of the intellectuals is above all one of ideology, and it is not helpful but harmful to resort to crude and heavy-handed measures for solving ideological questions. The remoulding of the intellectuals, and especially the changing of their world outlook, is a process that requires a long period of time. Our comrades must understand that ideological remoulding involves long-term, patient and painstaking work, and they must not attempt to change people’s ideology, which has been shaped over decades of life, by giving a few lectures or by holding a few meetings. Persuasion, not

coercion, is the only way to convince people. Coercion will never result in convincing people. To try to make them submit by force simply won't do. This kind of method is permissible in dealing with the enemy, but absolutely impermissible in dealing with comrades or friends. What if we don't know how to convince others? Then we have to learn. We must learn to conquer erroneous ideas through debate and reasoning.

"Let a hundred flowers blossom" is the way to develop the arts, and "let a hundred schools of thought contend" the way to develop science. Not only is this a good method for developing science and the arts, but, applied more widely, it is a good method for all our work. It enables us to make fewer mistakes. There are many things we don't understand and are therefore unable to tackle, but through debate and struggle we shall come to understand them and learn how to tackle them. Truth develops through debate between different views. The same method can be adopted in dealing with whatever is poisonous and anti-Marxist, because in the struggle against it Marxism will develop. This is development through the struggle of opposites, development conforming to dialectics.

Haven't people discussed the true, the good and the beautiful all through the ages? Their opposites are the false, the evil and the ugly. The former would not exist without the latter. Truth stands in opposition to falsehood. In society as in nature, every entity invariably divides into different parts, only there are differences in content and form under different concrete conditions. There will always be wrong things and ugly phenomena. There will always be such opposites as the right and the wrong, the good and the evil, the beautiful and the ugly. The same is true of fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds. The relationship between them is one of the unity and struggle of opposites. Only by comparing can one distinguish. Only by making distinctions and waging struggle can there be development. Truth develops through its struggle against falsehood. This is how Marxism develops. Marxism develops in the struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, and it is only through struggle that it can develop.

We are for the policy of "opening wide"; so far there has been too little of it rather than too much. We must not be afraid of "opening wide", nor should we be afraid of criticism and poisonous weeds. Marxism is scientific truth; it fears no criticism and cannot be overthrown by criticism. The same holds for the Communist Party and the People's Government; they fear no criticism and cannot be toppled by it. There will always be things that are wrong, and that is nothing

to be afraid of. Recently, ghosts and monsters have been presented on the stage. Some comrades have become very worried by this spectacle. In my opinion, a little of this doesn't matter much; within a few decades such ghosts and monsters will disappear from the stage altogether, and you won't be able to see them even if you want to. We must promote what is right and oppose what is wrong, but we need not be frightened if people come in contact with erroneous things. It will solve no problem simply to issue administrative orders forbidding people to have any contact with perverse and ugly phenomena and with erroneous ideas, or forbidding them to see ghosts and monsters on the stage. Of course, I am not advocating the spread of such stuff, I am only saying "a little of this doesn't matter much". It is not at all strange that erroneous things should exist, nor should this give any cause for fear; indeed it helps people learn to struggle against them better. Even great storms are not to be feared. It is amid great storms that human society progresses.

In our country bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology and anti-Marxist ideologies will persist for a long time. Basically, the socialist system has been established in our country. While we have won basic victory in transforming the ownership of the means of production, we are even farther from complete victory on the political and ideological fronts. In the ideological field, the question of who will win out, the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, has not yet been really settled. We still have to wage a protracted struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. It is wrong not to understand this and to give up ideological struggle. All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstances should they be allowed to spread freely. However, the criticism should be fully reasoned, analytical and convincing, and neither rough and bureaucratic, nor metaphysical and dogmatic.

For a long time now people have been levelling a lot of criticism at dogmatism. That is as it should be. But they often neglect to criticize revisionism. Both dogmatism and revisionism run counter to Marxism. Marxism must necessarily advance; it must develop along with practice and cannot stand still. It would become lifeless if it were stagnant and stereotyped. However, the basic principles of Marxism must never be violated, otherwise mistakes will be made. It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to regard it as something rigid. It is revisionism to negate the basic principles of Marxism and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form

of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line. In present circumstances, revisionism is more pernicious than dogmatism. It is an important task for us to unfold criticism of revisionism on the ideological front now.

Eighth and last, it is imperative for the Party committees of the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions to tackle the question of ideology. This is a point some of the comrades present here want me to touch upon. In many places, the Party committees have not yet tackled the question of ideology, or have done very little about it. Mainly because they are busy. But tackle it they must. By “tackling it” I mean that it must be put on the agenda and studied. In the main the large-scale, turbulent class struggles of the masses characteristic of times of revolution in our country have come to an end, but there is still class struggle — chiefly on the political and ideological fronts — and it is very acute too. The question of ideology has now assumed great importance. The first secretaries of the Party committees in all provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions should personally tackle this question, which can be solved correctly only when they have given it serious attention and gone into it. Meetings on propaganda work similar to our present one should be held in all these places to discuss local ideological work and all related problems. Such meetings should be attended not only by Party comrades but also by people outside the Party, and people with different opinions should be included. This will be all to the good of these meetings, and no harm can come of it, as the experience of the present conference has proved.

NOTES

¹ “On Production by the Army for Its Own Support and on the Importance of the Great Movements for Rectification and for Production”, *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. III.

PERSEVERE IN PLAIN LIVING AND HARD STRUGGLE, MAINTAIN CLOSE TIES WITH THE MASSES

March 1957

1

Our Party is going to unfold a rectification movement. This is a way of resolving contradictions within the Party through criticism and self-criticism and also of resolving contradictions between the Party and the people. This time the movement will be aimed at three bad styles, bureaucracy, sectarianism and subjectivism. Through rectification we must strive to carry forward our Party's tradition of plain living and hard struggle. Since our victory in the revolution, the revolutionary will of some of our comrades has been waning, their revolutionary enthusiasm has been ebbing, their spirit of whole-hearted service to the people has been flagging, and so has the death-defying spirit they displayed in the days of fighting against our enemies; at the same time, they are clamouring for position and for the limelight, becoming particular about what they eat and wear, competing for salary and scrambling for fame and gain — all these tendencies are growing. I have heard that during the grading of cadres last year, some people burst into tears and made terrible scenes. People have two eyes, haven't they? Drops of water welling up in them are called tears. When the grading doesn't meet their wishes, tears begin to stream down their cheeks. They never shed a single tear during the war against Chiang Kai-shek, the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, the agrarian reform and the suppression of counter-revolutionaries, nor have they shed a tear

Section 1 is part of a speech at a conference of Party cadres in Tsinan on March 18, 1957, and Section 2 is part of a speech at a conference of Party cadres in Nanking on March 19 of the same year.

during the building of socialism, but as soon as their personal interests were affected, rivers of tears began to flow. I have even heard of someone refusing to eat for three days. I would say, it doesn't matter much if one doesn't eat for three days, but it would be a little dangerous if that went on for a week. In short, the tendency has emerged of contending for fame and position, of comparing salaries, food, clothing and comforts. To go on hunger strike and shed tears on account of one's personal interests may be considered a kind of contradiction among the people. There is an opera scene called *Lin Chung Flees at Night*,¹ in which one line goes, "A man does not easily shed tears until his heart is broken." Now some of our comrades are men (and probably women too) about whom it can be said that they do not easily shed tears until it comes to grading. Such behaviour must be rectified too, mustn't it? It is right not to shed tears easily, but when is one's heart broken? When the destiny of the working class and the masses of the working people is at stake. Then one may shed a few tears. Whatever rank you are given, you should take it even if you are graded incorrectly, and you should not let your tears out but keep them in. There is much that is unfair in this world, and maybe you have been improperly graded, but even so there is no reason to make a fuss about it, for it is inconsequential and you should rest content as long as you have enough to eat. After all, we are a revolutionary Party, so we make it a principle not to allow anybody to starve to death. As long as one isn't starving to death, one should do revolutionary work and exert oneself. Even ten thousand years from now people should work hard. A Communist is supposed to work hard and to serve the people with his whole heart, not with half or two-thirds. Those whose revolutionary will has been waning should have their spirits revived through rectification.

2

We should maintain the same vigour, the same revolutionary enthusiasm and the same death-defying spirit we displayed in the years of the revolutionary wars and carry our revolutionary work through to the end. What is meant by death-defying? In the novel *Water Margin* there is a character called Death-Defying Third Brother Shih Hsiu, whose spirit is exactly what we have in mind. It was with this spirit that we made revolution in the past. A man has but one life to live, and

he may live to sixty, seventy, eighty or ninety, it all depends. At least you should do some work as long as you can. And you should do it with revolutionary enthusiasm and a death-defying spirit. Some comrades are lacking in this enthusiasm and spirit and have stopped making progress. This is not a wholesome phenomenon, and education should be conducted among them.

The whole Party should strengthen political and ideological work. Quite a number of comrades present at today's conference are from the army. How are things in the army? Isn't there some difference between political work in peace-time and in wartime? In wartime close ties must be forged with the masses, the officers must be integrated with the men and the army with the people. In such times the people excuse us if we have some shortcomings. Now it is peace-time, we have no battles to fight and all we have to do is to train; if we do not persist in maintaining close ties with the masses, they will naturally find it hard to excuse our shortcomings. Although the system of military ranks² and other systems have been instituted, those with higher rank should still be at one with their subordinates and the cadres with the soldiers, and subordinates should still be allowed to criticize their superiors and soldiers to criticize cadres. For instance, a Party conference can be convened to provide an opportunity to make criticisms. During the movement against the "three evils", Comrade Chen Yi put it aptly when he said, "It was all right for us to issue orders for so many years, wouldn't it be all right now to let our subordinates criticize us for a while, say for a week?" What he meant was that it ought to be all right. I agree with him, let our subordinates have one week to criticize us. Before the criticisms begin, make some preparations, then give some sort of report and say something about your own shortcomings, which probably won't amount to more than one, two, three, or four points. Then let the comrades speak, adding some points and making criticisms. The masses are fair-minded, they won't write off our record. Company and platoon commanders should also offer their men an opportunity to make criticisms, and it would be best to do so once a year by holding criticism meetings for several days in a row. In the past we practised democracy of this kind in the army, and with good results. Don't let the close relations between the higher and lower levels, between officers and men, between the army and the people and between the armed forces and the local authorities be impaired as a result of the adoption of the system of military ranks and other systems. It goes without saying that the higher levels should maintain close relations with the lower

levels and that these should be comradely. Cadres should forge close ties with soldiers and be integrated with them. The armed forces should likewise maintain close relations with the people and with the local Party and government organizations.

Our comrades should take note: Don't live on the power of your office, your high position or seniority. Speaking of seniority, we have been making revolution for many years, and while this record of ours does count, still we must not live on it. True, you are a veteran who has worked for several decades. For all that, when you do something foolish and talk nonsense, the people won't excuse you. No matter how many your good deeds in the past and no matter how high your post, if today you are not doing a good job, not solving problems correctly and thus harming the people's interests, they won't forgive you. Therefore our comrades should rely not on seniority but on being correct in solving problems. What counts here is correctness, not seniority. Since you cannot rely on your seniority, you might as well forget about it, as if you had never been an official at all, that is, you must stop putting on the airs of an overlord, of a bureaucrat, you must put aside your airs and go among the people and among your subordinates.-

This is a point our cadres, and particularly our old cadres, must keep in mind. Generally speaking, new cadres are not so burdened, are less encumbered. Old cadres should treat new cadres on an equal footing. In many ways old cadres are not as good as new cadres and should learn from them.

NOTES

¹ *Lin Chung Flees at Night* is a scene in the Kunchu opera *The Story of a Sword* composed in the Ming Dynasty. The Kunchu opera originated in Kunshan, Kiangsu.

² The system of military ranks was initiated in September 1955 and abolished in May 1965.

THINGS ARE BEGINNING TO CHANGE

May 15, 1957

The unity and struggle of opposites are universal phenomena in the life of society. Struggle results in the transformation of opposites into each other and in the formation of a new unity, and the life of society thus moves one step forward.

The rectification movement in the Communist Party is a struggle between two styles in a single entity. This is true of the Communist Party and also of the people as a whole.

There are different kinds of people in the Communist Party. There are Marxists, who comprise the majority. They, too, have shortcomings but not serious ones. There are a number of people whose thinking errs on the side of dogmatism. Most of them are staunch and steadfast and devoted to the Party and the country, only their approach to problems shows a “Left” one-sidedness. After overcoming this one-sidedness, they will take a big step forward. There are also a number of people whose thinking errs on the side of revisionism or Right opportunism. They pose the bigger danger because their ideas are a reflection of bourgeois ideology inside the Party, and because they yearn for bourgeois liberalism, negate everything and are tied in a hundred and one ways to bourgeois intellectuals outside the Party. Over the last few months, people have been criticizing dogmatism but have allowed revisionism to go unchallenged. Dogmatism should be criticized, or else many mistakes cannot be rectified. Now it’s time to direct our attention to criticizing revisionism. When dogmatism turns into its opposite, it becomes either Marxism or revisionism. Our Party’s experience shows that there have been many instances of dogmatism turning into Marxism but very few of dogmatism turning into revisionism, because the dogmatists represent a proletarian school of thought tainted with petty-bourgeois fanaticism. In some cases what

Article written by Comrade Mao Tsetung and circulated among Party cadres.

is attacked as “dogmatism” is in fact mistakes in work. In other cases what is attacked as “dogmatism” is in fact Marxism itself, which certain people mistake for “dogmatism” and attack as such. Real dogmatists think that it is better to be on the “Left” than on the Right, and they have a reason — they want revolution. But in terms of damage to the revolutionary cause, to be on the “Left” is in no way better than to be on the Right and should therefore be resolutely corrected. Some mistakes are the result of carrying out the policies of the central authorities, and people at the lower levels should not be given an undue share of the blame. There are a great many new members in our Party (even more in the Youth League) who are intellectuals, and it is true that a number of them are rather seriously afflicted with revisionist ideas. They deny the Party spirit and class nature of the press, they confound the differences in principle between proletarian journalism and bourgeois journalism, and they confuse journalism reflecting the collective economy of socialist countries with journalism reflecting the economy of capitalist countries, which is marked by anarchy and rivalry among monopoly groups. They admire bourgeois liberalism and are against the leadership of the Party. They favour democracy and reject centralism. They are opposed to what is essential to the realization of a planned economy, that is, leadership, planning and control in the cultural and educational fields (journalism included), which are indispensable and at the same time not unduly centralized. These people and right-wing intellectuals outside the Party act in concert and form a congenial lot, hitting it off like sworn brothers. Dogmatism is being criticized by various kinds of people. By Communists, that is, Marxists. By so-called Communists, that is, Rightists in the Communist Party — revisionists. And outside the Party, by the Left, the middle and the Right. Large in number, this middle section accounts for about 70 per cent of all the intellectuals outside the Party, while the Left makes up about 20 per cent, and the Right about 1, 3, 5 or up to 10 per cent, as the case may be.

In recent days the Rightists in the democratic parties and institutions of higher education have shown themselves to be most determined and most rabid. They think the middle elements are on their side and will not follow the lead of the Communist Party, but this is actually a pipe dream. Some of the middle elements are wavering, may swing either left or right and, in the face of the current spate of wild attacks by the Rightists, may want to keep mum and wait and see. To date, the Rightists have yet to reach the climax of their attack, and they are going at it in high spirits. Rightists, both inside and outside the Party,

know nothing about dialectics — things turn into their opposites when they reach the extreme. We shall let the Rightists run amuck for a time and let them reach their climax. The more they run amuck, the better for us. Some say they are afraid of being hooked like a fish, and others say they are afraid of being lured in deep, rounded up and annihilated. Now that large numbers of fish have come to the surface of themselves, there is no need to bait the hook. They are no ordinary fish, but more likely man-eating sharks with sharp teeth — it is these sharks whose fins people eat. Our struggle with the Rightists is centred on winning over the middle elements, who can be won over to our side. The Rightists' pledge of support to the people's democratic dictatorship, to the People's Government, to socialism and to the leadership of the Communist Party is all a sham, and on no account should any credence be given it. This holds true for all Rightists, whether in the democratic parties, in the fields of education, literature and art, the press, science and technology, or in industrial and commercial circles. There are two kinds of people who are most determined — the Left and the Right. Both are trying to win over the middle elements and gain the leadership over them. The Rightists are trying to seize first a part and then the whole. To begin with, they are out to gain leadership in the press, education, literature and art, and science and technology. They know that in these fields the Communists are not as strong as they are, which is actually the case. They are "national treasures", not to be rubbed the wrong way. The movement against the "three evils", the elimination of counter-revolutionaries and the ideological remoulding in past years — how outrageous and what impudence! They also know that many college students come from landlord, rich peasant or bourgeois families and believe these people will rise at their call. This likelihood exists for that section of the student body with Right deviationist ideas. But to assume it is true of most students is sheer fantasy. There are also indications that the Rightists in press circles are instigating the worker and peasant masses to oppose the government.

Some people are against the pinning of political labels, but only when it is they who are being labelled by the Communist Party. But they themselves feel free to slap labels on Communists and on the Left and middle elements in the democratic parties and in all walks of life. What a rash of labels tossed out by the Rightists has found its way into the press in the last few months! The middle elements are sincere in their opposition to labelling. All the inappropriate labels we pinned on the middle elements in the past should be removed and indiscriminate

labelling should be avoided in the future. If injustices were really done to certain people, no matter who, in the movement against the “three evils”, in the elimination of counter-revolutionaries and in the ideological remoulding, they should be publicly corrected. But labelling the Rightists is a different matter. Even so, the cap must fit, and only confirmed Rightists should be labelled as such. With few exceptions, the Rightists need not be publicly identified by name, but should be given some leeway so that it will be easier for them to compromise in appropriate circumstances. The number of Rightists set above at 1, 3, 5 and up to 10 per cent is only an estimate, and it may turn out to be larger or smaller. Moreover, conditions vary in different units, and it is therefore essential to have conclusive evidence, adopt an objective approach and avoid excesses, for excesses are a mistake.

The bourgeoisie and many of the intellectuals who formerly served the old society are invariably stubborn in asserting themselves, invariably yearn for that old world of theirs and invariably find themselves somewhat out of their element in the new. It will take quite a long time to remould them, and in the process crude methods should not be used. On the other hand, we must take into account the fact that, compared with the early days of liberation, most of them have made considerable progress, and their criticisms of our work are mostly correct and must be accepted. Only some of the criticisms are wrong, and in such cases matters should be clarified. It is in order for them to ask to be trusted and given authority commensurate with their positions; they must be trusted and given authority and responsibility. Some of the criticisms made even by the Rightists are correct and should not be categorically rejected. Their criticisms, wherever correct, should be accepted. The Rightists are characterized by their Rightist political attitude. The kind of co-operation they maintain with us is co-operation only in appearance and not in essence. There is co-operation on some matters, but not on others. There is co-operation in normal circumstances, but when there is an opening which can be used, as at the present juncture, they don't really want any co-operation. They go back on their pledge to accept the leadership of the Communist Party and try to shake it off. But without this leadership, it would be impossible to build socialism and our nation would be plunged into total disaster.

In China, the bourgeois elements and the intellectuals who served the old society number several million, and we need them to work for us; we must further improve our relations with them so that we can

enable them to give better service to the cause of socialism and so that we can further remould them and help them gradually become part of the working class, thus transforming them into the opposite of what they are today. Most of them are sure to reach this goal. Remoulding involves both unity and struggle, with struggle as the means to achieve unity, which is the end. Struggle is mutual; now is the time that many people are waging struggle against us. The criticisms made by most people are valid or essentially so, including the sharp criticisms by Professor Fu Ying of Peking University, which have not been published in the press. They are making their criticisms in the hope of improving their relations with us, so these criticisms are well-intentioned. But the Rightists' criticisms are usually malicious, because they are antagonistic. Intentions, whether good or bad, are not a matter of guesswork, they can be perceived.

The current criticism and rectification movement has been launched by the Communist Party. As we expected and hoped, poisonous weeds have been growing side by side with fragrant flowers and ghosts and monsters appearing together with the unicorn and phoenix. Anyway, good things outnumber bad. Some say we are trying to catch big fish, and we say we are digging up poisonous weeds, which are only different ways of saying the same thing. In order to achieve their end, the Rightists, who are anti-Communist, are making a desperate attempt to stir up a typhoon above force 7 in China, strong enough to devastate crops and houses. The more outrageous their conduct, the more quickly will they show themselves up as doing the opposite of co-operating with the Communist Party and accepting its leadership, as they pretended in the past, and the people will thus recognize them as nothing but a handful of ghosts and monsters opposed to the Communist Party and the people. They will then end up by burying themselves. Is there anything bad about that?

There are two alternatives for the Rightists. One is to keep their tails tucked between their legs and mend their ways. The other is to go on making trouble and court ruin. Gentlemen Rightists, the choice is yours, the initiative (for a short time) is in your hands.

In our country, there are several criteria by which to judge whether the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals are politically honest or dishonest, good or bad. The main thing is to see whether they really accept socialism and really accept the leadership of the Communist Party. They agreed to both long ago, but now some want to go back on their word,

and this will not do. Once they back out, there is no place for them in the People's Republic of China. Your ideals are those of the Western world (also known as the free world), you might as well go there.

Why is such a torrent of reactionary, vicious statements being allowed to appear in the press? To let the people have some idea of these poisonous weeds and noxious fumes so as to have them uprooted or dispelled.

“Why didn't you say all this earlier?” Didn't we? Didn't we say long ago that all poisonous weeds must be uprooted?

“You divide people into the Left, the middle and the Right. Isn't that contrary to how things stand?” Wherever there are masses of people — everywhere except deserts — they are invariably divided into the Left, the middle and the Right, and this will be so ten thousand years hence. Is that contrary to how things stand? This division will serve as a guide for the masses to size up people and will make it easier to win over the middle elements and isolate the Rightists.

“Why not win over the Rightists?” We shall try. But it won't be possible to win them over until they feel isolated. How can they be amenable when they are riding their high horse and are so bent on destroying the Communist Party? Isolation will cause a split, and we must bring about a split among the Rightists. It has all along been our practice to divide people into the Left, the middle and the Right, or in other words, progressive, middle-of-the-road and backward; this is nothing new, only some people have a short memory.

Are you going to “fix” people with a vengeance? It depends on how the Rightist gentlemen behave themselves. Poisonous weeds are to be uprooted, and this means uprooting the ideological poisonous weeds. To “fix” people is another matter. No one will be “fixed” unless he “grossly violates the law”. Then what is meant by “gross violation of the law”? It means serious damage to the interests of the state and the people as a result of the evil-doer's wilful actions despite repeated warnings. As for people who commit ordinary errors, there is all the more reason to apply the principle of curing the sickness to save the patient. This is the proper distinction to be observed both inside and outside the Party. To “fix” also means to cure the sickness to save the patient.

How long will it take the Party to accomplish the task of rectification? Events are now moving very fast and the relations between the Party and the masses will rapidly improve. Apparently, the task will

take a few weeks in some places, a few months in others and about a year in still others (for instance, the rural areas). But studying Marxism and raising the ideological level will take much longer.

Our unity and struggle with the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals will go on for a long time. When the rectification movement inside the Communist Party is basically over, we shall suggest that the democratic parties and people in all walks of life carry out their own rectification, which will accelerate their progress and make it easier to isolate the handful of right-wingers. Now it is people outside the Party who are helping us in our rectification. Later on we shall help them in theirs. This help is mutual, in the course of which what is evil will be done away with, that is, turned into its opposite, into what is good. This is exactly what the people expect of us, and we ought to gratify their wishes.

THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY IS THE CORE OF LEADERSHIP OF THE WHOLE CHINESE PEOPLE

May 25, 1957

Your congress has been very successful. I hope you will unite and serve as the core of leadership of the youth of China.

The Chinese Communist Party is the core of leadership of the whole Chinese people. Without this core, the cause of socialism cannot be victorious.

Your congress is a congress of unity and will exert a tremendous influence on young people throughout China. I extend my congratulations to you.

Unite, comrades, and fight resolutely and courageously for the great cause of socialism. Any word or deed at variance with socialism is completely wrong.

Remarks by Comrade Mao Tsetung when he received the entire body of delegates to the Third National Congress of the New Democratic Youth League of China.

MUSTER OUR FORCES TO REPULSE THE RIGHTISTS' WILD ATTACKS

June 8, 1957

Fifteen days or so will be sufficient for the free airing of views in organizations at the provincial and municipal level and in colleges and universities. The reactionary elements have been unbridled in their attacks. Among Party and League members the waverers have already deserted to them or are contemplating desertion. Among the vast numbers of Party and League members the activists and middle elements are rising to give battle. Using the big-character poster as a weapon, both sides are gaining experience and being tempered in the struggle. We needn't worry, for the reactionary elements number no more than a few per cent and the most frantic only 1 per cent. Don't be scared stiff just because the sky appears overcast for the time being. The reactionary elements will go out from their own organizations or colleges to carry on their activities in factories and other colleges, and precautions should be taken to keep them out. Call meetings of the principal cadres and veteran workers in the factories and explain to them that some bad capitalists, bad intellectuals and reactionary elements in society are mounting wild attacks against the working class and the Communist Party in an attempt to overthrow the state power led by the working class, and that they should make sure not to be taken in by these persons. Stop anyone trying to incite the people. Mobilize the masses to tear down reactionary posters on street walls. Factory workers should be clear about the over-all situation and must not stir up any trouble. During this time, they should not raise such matters as welfare and wages but should concert their actions against the reactionaries.

Inner-Party directive drafted for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

Please watch out for the wild attacks of the reactionary elements in the democratic parties. Get each of these parties to organize forums with the Left, middle and Right elements all taking part, let both positive and negative opinions be voiced, and send reporters to cover these discussions. We should tactfully encourage the Left and middle elements to speak out at the meetings and refute the Rightists. This is very effective. The Party paper in each locality should have dozens of articles ready and publish them from day to day when the high tide of the attacks begins to ebb there. Make a point of organizing the middle and Left elements to write for the press. But before the tide is on the ebb, Party papers should restrict the number of articles expressing positive views (they can publish articles written by the middle elements). Give the masses a free hand in refuting the Rightists' big-character posters. Organize forums at colleges and universities to let professors speak their minds about the Party, and as far as possible try to get the Rightists to spew out all their venom, which will be published in the newspapers. Let the professors make speeches and let the students respond freely. Better let the reactionary professors, lecturers, assistants and students spew out their venom and speak without any inhibitions. They are the best teachers. When the opportune moment arrives, lose no time in organizing separate meetings of Party and League members to sort out the criticisms; accept those criticisms that are constructive and correct mistakes and shortcomings, but refute those criticisms that are destructive. At the same time, organize some non-Party people to make speeches and state the correct views. Then, have a responsible Party cadre who enjoys prestige make a summing-up speech that is both analytical and convincing to effect a complete change in the atmosphere. If all goes well, a month or so will see the whole process through and we can then switch to the inner-Party rectification, which will proceed like "a gentle breeze and a mild rain".

This is a great political and ideological struggle. Only by waging it can our Party keep the initiative, temper our cadres, educate the masses, isolate the reactionaries and put them on the defensive. During the past seven years, we seemed to have the initiative, but this was at best only half true. The surrender of the reactionaries was a sham, and many of the middle elements submitted unwillingly. Now the situation has begun to change. Though outwardly on the defensive, we are actually gaining the initiative. The reason is that we are carrying out the rectification in all seriousness. The reactionaries who have lost their heads and run wild only appear to have the initiative, but they

have gone too far and as a result are alienating the people and finding themselves on the defensive. As the situation varies from place to place, you can be flexible in your tactics and dispositions.

In short, this is a big battle (with the battleground both inside and outside the Party). If we don't win this battle, it will be impossible to attain socialism and there may even be some danger of a "Hungarian incident". Now by launching the rectification of our own accord, we have purposely invited a possible "Hungarian incident" and broken it down into many small "Hungarian incidents" staged in various organizations and colleges and dealt with individually. Besides, the Party and government have not been thrown into disarray except for a very small section (it is just fine that this small section has gone rotten, for this means that the pus has been squeezed out). All this is very beneficial. Since there were reactionaries in our society, since the middle elements had never received the lessons they are now getting and since the Party had never undergone such tests as the present one, it was inevitable for disturbances to occur sooner or later.

Today, the situation at home is excellent, we have the workers, the peasants, the Party, the government, the army and the majority of students firmly with us. The international situation is excellent and the United States is in a difficult position.

WEN HUI PAO'S BOURGEOIS ORIENTATION SHOULD BE CRITICIZED

July 1, 1957

Since June 14, when our editorial department published "The Bourgeois Orientation of *Wen Hui Pao* over a Period of Time", both *Wen Hui Pao* and the *Kuangming Daily* have undertaken some self-criticism on this question.

The staff of the *Kuangming Daily* held several meetings and severely criticized its director, Chang Po-chun, and its editor-in-chief, Chu An-ping, for their wrong orientation. This criticism was unequivocal and there has been a basic change in stand, a change to the revolutionary socialist line from the bourgeois line of Chang Po-chun and Chu An-ping opposing the Communist Party, the people and socialism. As a result, the *Kuangming Daily* has regained the reader's confidence and reads like a socialist paper. Only the technique of its layout still leaves something to be desired. Technique in layout and political slant in layout are two different things, and as far as the *Kuangming Daily* is concerned, there is not enough of the former but quite enough of the latter. Technique is something it is entirely possible to improve. A change in the technique of layout would give the paper a new look which its readers would be glad to see. Nonetheless it is not easy; our paper has long set its mind on this, but its layout, though somewhat improved, is still not up to expectations.

Wen Hui Pao has published its self-criticism, giving the impression that a change has come about in its orientation, and it has carried many news items and articles reflecting the positive line — this of course is all to the good. Still, there is something lacking. It is just like performing on the stage, where some actors give fine portrayals as villains but never look right in their roles as heroes, they are so affected and unnatural.

Editorial written for the *People's Daily*.

It is indeed difficult for them to be otherwise. Either the East Wind prevails over the West Wind, or the West Wind prevails over the East Wind; on the question of the two lines there is no room for compromise. Many editors and reporters are used to the old and beaten tracks, and it is far from easy for them to change all at once. But change they must, however grudgingly and painfully, for this is dictated by the general trend. When people say that the change is easy and pleasant, they are saying so merely out of conventional politeness. This is only human and should be excused. As for the editorial department of *Wen Hui Pao*, the matter is serious because it was this editorial department which was in command during the period when the paper kicked up a rumpus with its bourgeois orientation, and so there is a heavy burden on its shoulders which cannot be easily thrown off. As to whether there is another commander higher up, those who make this charge say "yes", while those who speak for the defence say "no"; moreover, this commander has been identified as Lo Lung-chi of the alliance of Chang Po-chun and Lo Lung-chi. In between the two commanders, there is a third in the person of Pu Hsi-hsiu, a capable woman of action in charge of the Peking office of *Wen Hui Pao*. People say that Lo Lung-chi — Pu Hsi-hsiu — the *Wen Hui Pao* editorial department represents the chain of command of the Rightists in the Democratic League directing *Wen Hui Pao*.

The Democratic League has played a particularly vicious role in the course of the contention among the hundred schools of thought and the rectification movement. It operates in an organized way, complete with a plan, programme and line which alienate it from the people and which are directed against the Communist Party and socialism. Then there is the Peasants' and Workers' Democratic Party which has played exactly the same role. These two parties have made themselves particularly conspicuous in these days of violent storm. It is the Chang-Lo alliance which has raised the storm. Other parties have played their role, and some of their members are very vicious, too. But they are smaller in number and their chain of command is not so obvious. As for the rank and file of the Democratic League and the Peasants' and Workers' Democratic Party, not all nor even the majority of them are involved. After all, it is only a handful of individuals, namely, the leading bourgeois Rightists, who summon the storm and churn the waves, plot in secret and incite discontent among the masses, make contacts high and low and seek responses far and near; it is only they whose estimate of the current situation is that utter confusion every-

where will lead to their take-over and whose ultimate aim is to complete their grand scheme by gradual steps. Among the members of these parties some keep their heads, many are deceived, and a small number make up the nucleus of the right wing. Few as they are, being the nucleus, they have considerable power to manipulate. All this spring, the sky over China suddenly became overcast with rolling dark clouds, and the source of the trouble can be traced to the Chang-Lo alliance.

Two meetings were called by the Journalists' Association, the first a negation and the second a negation of the negation, and the fact that this took place in a little over a month indicates the swift changes in the situation in China. The meetings were helpful. At the first meeting, "dark clouds bearing down on the city threatened to crush it", as the reactionary bourgeois line in journalism asserted itself. But at the second, begun the other day, the atmosphere has changed and, although the Rightists are still stubbornly resisting, most people can be said to have found the correct orientation.

On June 14, *Wen Hui Pao* made a self-criticism and admitted it had made some mistakes. It is all very well to make self-criticism and we welcome it. But we consider *Wen Hui Pao's* self-criticism inadequate. And what is inadequate here is fundamental in character. That is to say, fundamentally the paper made no self-criticism. On the contrary, in the editorial of June 14 it tried to defend its mistakes. "We have one-sidedly and incorrectly interpreted the Party's policy on the free airing of views, believing that unqualified encouragement of the free airing of views would of itself help the Party in the rectification movement, and that more space given to positive views or criticisms to counter the wrong views would hinder the free airing of views." Is that so? No. During the spring *Wen Hui Pao* pursued the policy of the central authorities of the Democratic League opposing the Communist Party, the people and socialism and launched violent attacks on the proletariat, in diametrical opposition to the policy of the Communist Party. It was a policy designed to topple the Communist Party and create utter confusion everywhere to facilitate a take-over. Can this really be called "helping in the rectification movement"? No, that is a lie, a downright swindle. Was it wrong for a while to refrain from publishing any positive views or to publish only a few and to let erroneous views go unrefuted? Between May 8 and June 7, acting on the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, our paper and all the other Party papers did precisely that. The purpose was to let demons and devils, ghosts and monsters "air

views freely” and let poisonous weeds sprout and grow in profusion, so that the people, now shocked to find these ugly things still existing in the world, would take action to wipe them out. In other words, the Communist Party foresaw this inevitable class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals were allowed to start this war, and for a time the press refrained from publishing any positive views or published only a few and did not take any action to repulse the wild attacks of the reactionary bourgeois Rightists, nor did the Party organization in any of the departments and schools where the rectification movement was in progress. The masses could thus clearly distinguish those whose criticism was well-intentioned from those whose so-called criticism was malevolent, and thus forces could be mustered to counter-attack when the time was ripe. Some people say this was a covert scheme. We say it was an overt one. For we made it plain to the enemy beforehand: only when ghosts and monsters are allowed to come into the open can they be wiped out; only when poisonous weeds are allowed to sprout from the soil can they be uprooted. Don't the peasants weed several times a year? Besides, uprooted weeds can be used as manure. The class enemies will invariably seek opportunities to assert themselves. They will not resign themselves to losing state power and being expropriated. However much the Communist Party warns its enemies in advance and makes its basic strategy known to them, they will still launch attacks. Class struggle is an objective reality, independent of man's will. That is to say, class struggle is inevitable. It cannot be avoided even if people want to avoid it. The only thing to do is to make the best use of the situation and guide the struggle to victory. Why do the reactionary class enemies bite the hook? As reactionary social groups blinded by the lust for gain, they take the absolute superiority of the proletariat for absolute inferiority. Fanning flames everywhere would stir up workers and peasants, students' big-character posters would facilitate the taking over of schools, free airing of views would touch off an explosive situation, there would be instant chaos everywhere and the Communist Party would crack up at once — this was how Chang Po-chun sized up the situation on June 6 for six professors in Peking. Isn't this a case of being blinded by the lust for gain? “Gain” means the grabbing of power. They have quite a few papers, one of them being *Wen Hui Pao*. This paper operated in accordance with the reactionary policy mentioned above, but on June 14 it tried to deceive the people, pretending that it had acted with good intentions. The paper

said, "And this incorrect understanding is due to the remnants of bourgeois ideas of journalism in our minds." No, here "remnants" should read "abundance". For several months the paper served as the mouthpiece of the reactionaries who mounted unbridled attacks against the proletariat, and it changed its orientation to one of opposing the Communist Party, the people and socialism, that is, to the bourgeois orientation — could it manage all that with just some odd remnants of bourgeois ideas? What sort of logic is this? A particular premise leads to a universal conclusion — this is *Wen Hui Pao's* logic. To this day *Wen Hui Pao* is still not ready to criticize itself for carrying a host of reactionary reports flying in the face of the facts, for printing a spate of reactionary views and opinions, and for splashing the paper with a reactionary layout as a means for attacking the proletariat. The case is different with *Hsin Min Pao*; it has made many self-criticisms which are quite sincere. *Hsin Min Pao's* mistakes were not as serious as *Wen Hui Pao's*, and when it realized that it had made mistakes it started correcting them in earnest; this shows a sense of responsibility towards the people's cause on the part of those in charge of the paper and its reporters, and thus in the eyes of the reader the paper has begun to free itself from its predicament. Where on earth is *Wen Hui Pao's* sense of responsibility? Just when will *Wen Hui Pao* begin to follow *Hsin Min Pao's* example? Debts must be paid, and when will *Wen Hui Pao* begin to pay its debt? In making self-criticism *Hsin Min Pao* has apparently raised lots of awkward questions for *Wen Hui Pao*, and the reader would like to ask, when will *Wen Hui Pao* catch up with *Hsin Min Pao*? *Wen Hui Pao* is now in a bad fix. Before *Hsin Min Pao* made its self-criticism, it seemed that *Wen Hui Pao* might be able to muddle along for a while, but after that things have become difficult. A bad fix can be turned into a good position, and that calls for a conscientious effort to emulate *Hsin Min Pao*.

Now to return to the term "bourgeois Rightists". Bourgeois Rightists are the bourgeois reactionaries mentioned above who oppose the Communist Party, the people and socialism; this definition is scientific and true to fact. Only a handful, they are to be found in the democratic parties, among intellectuals, capitalists and students and also in the Communist Party and Youth League, and they have surfaced in the present great storm. They are very small in number, but in the democratic parties, and particularly in certain of these parties, they carry weight and should not be taken lightly. This bunch have not only expressed themselves in words but also followed up with deeds; they are guilty,

and the principle of “blame not the speaker” does not apply to them. They are not only speakers but doers. Are they to be punished by law? There seems to be no need for that at present. For the people’s state is very secure and, moreover, many among them are prominent figures. They can be treated leniently, without punishment. In general, it is enough to call them “Rightists”, not reactionaries. The only exceptions are those who refuse to correct their mistakes after repeated warnings and continue to engage in sabotage in violation of the criminal law; these will have to be punished. Learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones, cure the sickness to save the patient, transform negative factors into positive ones — these principles still apply to the Rightists. Then there are Rightists of another kind who have expressed themselves in words but have not followed up with deeds. Their views are similar to those of the Rightists mentioned above, but they have not engaged in disruptive activities. There should be a greater degree of leniency towards them. Erroneous views must be repudiated root and branch with no quarter given, but these individuals should be permitted to reserve their opinions. The various types of Rightists mentioned above are allowed their freedom of speech. For a great, secure nation, there is little harm in keeping a small number of such people around when their mistakes are known to the masses. It must be understood that Rightists are persons who teach us by negative example. In this sense, poisonous weeds can render service. They render service precisely because they are poisonous and because in the past people were harmed by the poison they spread.

The Communist Party is continuing with its rectification and the democratic parties have also begun theirs. Now that the Rightists’ wild attacks have been repulsed by the people, the rectification movement can proceed smoothly.

BEAT BACK THE ATTACKS OF THE BOURGEOIS RIGHTISTS

July 9, 1957

In March I spoke here to a number of Party cadres. A hundred days have passed since then. During these hundred days a great change in the situation has occurred. We have fought a battle with the bourgeois Rightists, and the political consciousness of the people has risen, and indeed to a considerable degree. We expected this at the time. For instance, I said here that when people started criticizing, or in other words, when the fire started burning, wouldn't that cause pain? We must toughen our scalps and bear it, I added. This part of the body is called the head, and the skin on it is called the scalp. Toughening one's scalp and bearing it means, when you criticize me, I toughen my scalp and listen for a while. Afterwards, I'll analyse what you say and make a reply, accepting what is right and rebutting what is wrong.

We must believe that in China, as everywhere else in the world, the majority of the people are good. By the majority, we mean not 51 per cent but over 90 per cent. Of the 600 million people in our country, the worker and peasant masses are our mainstay. In the Communist Party, the Youth League and the democratic parties and among the students and intellectuals, the majority are invariably good people. They are kind-hearted and honest, they are not crafty and don't have ulterior motives. This should be acknowledged. It has been borne out in every political movement. Take the students in the present movement. There are more than seven thousand students at Peking University, but the Rightists account for only 1, 2 or 3 per cent. What does this 1, 2 or 3 per cent really mean? It means that the backbone die-hard elements who kick up a rumpus from time to time never exceed fifty persons or so, or less than 1 per cent. The remaining 1 or 2 per cent form their claque.

Speech at a conference of cadres in Shanghai.

It's not easy to set a fire going and draw it upon oneself. Now I hear that some comrades in this city rather regret that the fire was not fierce enough. I think the fire in Shanghai was about right, almost but not quite strong enough to be satisfying. Wouldn't you have let the fire rage if you had foreseen its miraculous effect? Let poisonous weeds sprout and ghosts and monsters appear. Why be afraid of them? I said in March you shouldn't be afraid. However, some comrades in our Party have been afraid that chaos would spread across the land. I say that, staunch and devoted to the Party and the country as these comrades are, they don't see the over-all situation, don't see that the vast majority of the people, that is, more than 90 per cent, are good. Don't be afraid of the masses, they are with us. They may rail at us but they will never strike us with their fists. The Rightists are only a handful, and at Peking University they make up only 1, 2 or 3 per cent, as I have just said. This applies to the students only. The case is different with the professors and associate professors, about 10 per cent of whom are Rightists. The Left also amounts to about 10 per cent. The two sides are matched in strength. The middle makes up approximately 80 per cent. So what is there to be afraid of? And yet some of our comrades are assailed by fears of one kind or another, afraid of houses collapsing and the sky falling. From time immemorial no one but "the man of Chi worried lest the sky fall",¹ meaning that only one man from Honan was afraid it might happen. Save for this man, no one else is known to have entertained the fear. As for houses, I am sure this one will not collapse, as it was built not long ago. How can it collapse so easily?

In short, more than 90 per cent of the people everywhere are our friends and comrades. Don't be afraid. Why be afraid of the masses? There's no reason to be. What sort of persons are leading figures? Group leaders, team leaders, Party branch secretaries, heads of schools and colleges and Party committee secretaries — they are all leading figures, Comrade Ko Ching-shih counts among them and I too. At any rate all of us have some political capital, that is, we have performed some service for the people. Now the fire is set ablaze, and more than 90 per cent of the people hope that our comrades will be tempered in the fire. Every one of our comrades has his weaknesses. Who hasn't? "Men are not saints, how can they be free from faults?" One way or another, we say or do something wrong, for instance by being bureaucratic. These things are usually done unwittingly.

It is necessary to "set a fire going" at regular intervals. How often? Once a year or once every three years, which do you prefer? I think we

should do it at least twice in the space of each five-year plan, in the same way as the intercalary month in a lunar leap year turns up once in three years and twice in five. The Monkey Sun Wu-kung becomes much stronger after being tempered in the Eight-Diagram Magic Crucible of the God of Supreme Power. Isn't Sun Wu-kung a character of tremendous magical power? Even Sun, who is called "The Great Saint on a Par with the Emperor of Heaven", needs tempering in the Eight-Diagram Crucible. Don't we talk about tempering? Tempering means forging and refining. Forging is shaping by hammering and refining is smelting iron in a blast furnace or making steel in an open-hearth furnace. After steel is made, it needs forging, which nowadays is done with a pneumatic hammer. That hammering is terrific! We human beings need tempering too. Some comrades, when asked about being tempered, would appear very much in favour, saying, "Oh yes, I have shortcomings. I'm eager to get some tempering." Everybody says he wants it. To talk about it is very easy, but when it comes to the real thing, when it means being "forged" with a pneumatic hammer, he backs away, scared stiff. We have been in the midst of tempering. For a time there was gloom above and darkness below, with the rays of the sun and the moon completely shut out. Two winds were then blowing, one from the overwhelming majority, the good people, who put up big-character posters saying that the Communist Party had shortcomings and should overcome them, the other from a handful of Rightists who attacked us. These two offensives went for the same target. The offensive by the majority was justified and correct. It was a kind of tempering for us. The offensive by the Rightists was also a kind of tempering for us. For real tempering this time we have to thank the Rightists. They have given a most instructive lesson to our Party, to the masses, the working class) peasants, students and democratic parties. There are Rightists in every city and they want to topple us. We are now closing in on them.

Ours is a people's revolution, a revolution by 600 million people under the leadership of the proletariat; it is the people's cause. The democratic revolution was the people's cause, the socialist revolution is the people's cause and so is socialist construction. Then, are the socialist revolution and socialist construction good or not? Have there been achievements? Which is primary, achievements or mistakes? The Rightists negate the achievements in the people's cause. This is the first point. Second, which is the direction to take? One way leads to socialism and the other to capitalism. The Rightists want us to turn

round and take the capitalist road. Third, who is to lead in building socialism? The proletariat or the bourgeoisie? The Communist Party or those bourgeois Rightists? The Rightists say they don't want leadership by the Communist Party. I think this has been a great debate with the focus on these three questions. It is good to have a debate. In the past, there wasn't any debate on these questions.

There were prolonged debates in the course of the democratic revolution. In the last years of the Ching Dynasty up to the Revolution of 1911, in the fight against Yuan Shih-kai, in the Northern Expedition and the War of Resistance Against Japan — in each of these periods there were debates. To resist or not to resist Japan? One school preached the theory that weapons decide everything. China, they said, was short of arms and so could not resist Japan. Another school said that need not cause fear, for after all people were primary, and though inferior in arms we could still put up a fight. The War of Liberation that followed was preceded by debates. The Chungking negotiations, the old Political Consultative Conference held in Chungking and the Nanking negotiations were all debates. Chiang Kai-shek turned a deaf ear to our opinions and to those of the people, what he wanted was war. The outcome of the war was that he was beaten. So there were debates, a long period of mental preparation, in the course of the democratic revolution.

The socialist revolution came swiftly. In a matter of six or seven years the socialist transformation of capitalist ownership and of individual ownership by small producers has by and large been completed. But the transformation of man still has a long way to go, though some progress has been made. Socialist transformation is a twofold task, one is to transform the system and the other to transform man. The system embraces not only ownership, it also includes the superstructure, primarily the state apparatus and ideology. For instance, the press comes within the scope of ideology. Some people say that the press has no class nature and is not an instrument of class struggle. They are mistaken. Until at least the extinction of imperialism the press and everything else in the realm of ideology will reflect class relations. School education, literature and art all fall within the scope of ideology, belong to the superstructure and have a class nature. As for the natural sciences, there are two aspects. The natural sciences as such have no class nature, but the question of who studies and makes use of them does. In the universities, the departments of Chinese for one and the departments of history for another are most seriously

affected by idealism. So are the people who work on newspapers. Let no one suppose that idealism abounds only in the field of the social sciences, there is also a good deal in the field of the natural sciences. Many people who work in the natural sciences are idealists in their world outlook. When you ask them what water is composed of, they are materialists and say it is composed of two elements, which conforms with reality. When it comes to the transformation of society, they are idealists. While we say the Communist Party should be further strengthened through rectification, some of them say it should be wiped out. This is what the present movement has revealed.

When the Rightists were on the offensive, our policy was to listen and keep quiet. For several weeks we toughened our scalps, cocked our ears to listen and kept mum. Moreover, we didn't inform the Youth League and Party rank and file, nor did we inform the Party branch secretaries and Party branch committees, we just allowed a free-for-all fight where everybody was on his own. Some enemies had sneaked into the Party committees and general Party branches in the universities; for instance, they were on the Tsinghua University Party Committee. When there was a meeting, they would inform the enemy of what was going on. Such persons were dubbed "insurgents". Hadn't there been insurgent generals? Now there were "insurgent scholars". This pleased both the enemy and us. The enemy was very much pleased to see the "insurrection" of Communist Party members and the imminent "collapse" of the Communist Party. How many Party members have collapsed this time? I'm not clear about Shanghai. In Peking probably 5 per cent of the Party membership in the universities have collapsed, and the percentage is higher among the League members, perhaps 10 per cent or more. In my view, their collapse is exactly as it should be. In short, whether it was 10, 20, 30 or 40 per cent, I'm very happy that they have collapsed. Their minds are stuffed with bourgeois ideas and idealism and they have wormed their way into the Communist Party or the Youth League, they are nominally for communism, but are actually anti-Communists or waverers. So we were also pleased to see their "insurrection". When did we ever do such a thorough job of purifying the ranks of the Party and Youth League? These people scampered away of their own accord without our having to clear them out. But now the situation has changed and the tables have been turned. The "insurrection" stopped when we started closing in on the Rightists and when many who were not Rightists themselves but had connections with them came forward to

expose them. The Rightists are having a very hard time and some of them have rebelled. I spoke here in March. How things have changed in a hundred days!

The current struggle against the Rightists is essentially a political one. Class struggle takes various forms. This time it is chiefly a political, not a military or an economic, struggle. Is it partly an ideological struggle? Yes, it is, but in my view the struggle is mainly political. Ideological struggle will come chiefly in the next stage and should be like a gentle breeze and a mild rain. Rectification in the Communist Party and the Youth League is an ideological struggle. We must raise our level and really learn some Marxism. We must truly help each other. As for shortcomings, are we totally free from subjectivism or bureaucracy? We must really think hard, take notes and keep at it for a few months to raise our understanding of Marxism and our political and ideological level.

The counter-attack on the Rightists may take a few more weeks, a month or so. However, it would be impossible if the press kept on publishing the Rightists' views as it is now doing and continued for the rest of the year, next year and the year after. There are just so many Rightists, the press has carried just about enough of their views, and there isn't much more to print. From now on, we shall print a little more in some form or other but none when there is nothing worth printing. In my view July is still a month for intensive counter-attack on the Rightists. The Rightists like a strong gale and a torrential downpour most and a gentle breeze and a mild rain least. We advocate a gentle breeze and a mild rain, don't we? But they say, "What? A gentle breeze and a mild rain? If it keeps drizzling for days on end, the rice seedlings will rot and there will be a famine. It's better to have a strong gale and a torrential downpour." Haven't you got someone here in Shanghai who wrote an article "A Crow Caws 'at High Noon'"? That "crow" is the man who proposed having a strong gale and a torrential downpour. They also say, "You Communists are downright unfair. When you fixed us in the past, you preferred a strong gale and a torrential downpour, and now when your turn comes, you want a gentle breeze and a mild rain." The fact is that we always called for a gentle breeze and a mild rain in our previous inner-Party directives concerning ideological remoulding, including the criticism of Hu Shih and Liang Shu-ming. Everything in the world develops in twists and turns. For instance, when you walk, you never walk in a straight line. Have you ever been to Mogan Mountain?

There are eighteen hairpin bends on the way up. Society invariably moves forward in a spiral. Now the fight to ferret out the Rightists must go on without any let-up, and we must keep up the strong gale and torrential downpour. Just because they started it all, it may look as if we are trying to get even with them. It is only now that the Rightists realize how good a gentle breeze and a mild rain is. At the sight of a reed they try to cling to it, because they are sinking fast, like a drowning man in the Whangpoo River clutching at a straw. I suppose that "crow" must now be pining for a gentle breeze and a mild rain. But now it is stormy weather. After July, there will be a gentle breeze and a mild rain in August, for there won't be much left to ferret out.

The Rightists are very good teachers by negative example. China has always had teachers by both positive and negative example. People need to be educated by negative as well as positive example. Japanese imperialism was our first top-flight teacher by negative example. Previously there were the Ching government, Yuan Shih-kai and the Northern warlords, and then there was Chiang Kai-shek. They were all fine teachers by negative example. Without them the Chinese people could never have learned their lessons. The Communist Party served as the teacher by positive example, but this alone would not have been enough. This holds good to this day. There are people who refused to listen to many of the things we said. Who are they? Many of the middle elements, and particularly the Rightists. The former took us half seriously and half sceptically. The Rightists wouldn't listen to us at all. We told them our views on quite a number of issues but they turned a deaf ear and took a different course. For instance, we advocated "unity — criticism — unity", but they wouldn't listen. We said that achievements were primary in the elimination of counter-revolutionaries, but they denied it. We said there must be democratic centralism and people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the proletariat, but they denied it. We said we must unite with the socialist countries and the peace-loving people throughout the world, but they denied that too. In short, we told them all this before, but they wouldn't listen. There was another point which they particularly wouldn't listen to, namely, that poisonous weeds must be uprooted. Let ghosts and monsters come out and make an exhibition of themselves, and afterwards the people will say these ghosts and monsters are no good and must be eliminated. Let poisonous weeds sprout, then uproot them and plough them under for manure. Didn't

we say all this before? Of course we did. All the same, poisonous weeds keep sprouting. Year in year out, the peasants tell the weeds they are going to dig them up several times a year, but the weeds simply won't listen and keep growing. Even though digging will go on for ten thousand years, weeds will keep growing. They will grow even a hundred million years from now. When I talked about weeding, the Rightists were not afraid because I was only talking and weeding had not actually started. What is more, the Rightists considered that they were not poisonous weeds but fragrant flowers and that we were poisonous weeds and we, not they, should be uprooted. It just didn't occur to them that it was precisely they who should be uprooted.

A debate on the three questions referred to earlier is now in progress. The socialist revolution came so swiftly that the Party's general line for the transition period has not been fully debated either inside the Party or in society at large. This may be likened to a cow eating grass. It gulps the grass down, stores it in its stomach, then regurgitates it and slowly chews the cud. We have been making socialist revolution in the system, firstly in the ownership of the means of production and secondly in the superstructure, in the political system and the sphere of ideology, but there has never been a full debate on the question. And now we are unfolding the debate through the newspapers, forums, mass rallies and big-character posters.

The big-character poster is a fine thing and I think it will be handed down to future generations. The *Confucian Analects*, the *Five Classics*, the *Thirteen Classics* and the *Twenty-four Dynastic Histories* have all been handed down to us. Won't the big-character poster be handed down to posterity? I think it will. Will it be used in the future when rectification is unfolded, in factories for instance? I think it is a good idea to use it, the more the better. Like language, it has no class nature. Our vernacular has no class nature. We all speak in the vernacular and so does Chiang Kai-shek. We no longer speak literary Chinese exemplified by sayings like — "Great pleasure is derived from learning and constantly reviewing what has been learned" and "Welcoming friends from afar gives one great delight". The vernacular is used by the proletariat and also by the bourgeoisie. The big-character poster can be used by the bourgeoisie as well as by the proletariat. We believe that the majority of the people are on the side of the proletariat. Therefore, the big-character poster as an instrument favours the proletariat, not the bourgeoisie. For a period of time, about two or three weeks, things seemed to go in favour of the bourgeoisie,

with gloom above and darkness below and the rays of the sun and the moon completely shut out. When we said we must toughen our scalps and bear it, we meant losing sleep and appetite for those two or three weeks. Didn't you say you wanted tempering? To lose sleep and appetite for a few weeks is a kind of tempering, and this doesn't mean being shoved into a blast furnace to be smelted.

Many middle elements have vacillated, and this is a good thing too. They will draw lessons from their vacillation. It is the hallmark of the middle elements, otherwise would they be known as such? The proletariat is at one end and the bourgeoisie at the other, with large numbers of middle elements in between, a case of both ends being small and the middle being large. But in the final analysis the middle elements are good people, an ally of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie too wanted to win them over as an ally, and at one time they looked like it. For these middle elements also criticized us, but their criticisms were well-intentioned. When the Rightists saw them criticizing us, they came out and made trouble. In Shanghai, you had Rightists like Wang Tsao-shih, Lu Yi, Chen Jen-ping and Peng Wen-ying and also Wu Yin making trouble. Once the Rightists went at it, the middle elements got confused. The Rightists' progenitors are Chang Po-chun, Lo Lung-chi and Chang Nai-chi, and Peking is the Rightists' place of origin. The greater the chaos in Peking, the better, and the more profound it is, the better. This has been borne out by our experience.

Just now I talked about the big-character poster. It is a question of method, a question of what method to use in fighting. The big-character poster is one of the weapons used in fighting, like small arms such as the rifle, the pistol and the machine-gun. As for planes and field guns, perhaps they are *Wen Hui Pao*, the *Kuangming Daily* and some other newspapers. For a time the Party papers also carried the Rightists' views. We issued an order to the effect that all Rightists' views must be published verbatim. Through the use of this and other methods, we helped the broad masses to get educated by both positive and negative examples. The staff on the *Kuangming Daily* and *Wen Hui Pao*, for instance, have received a profound education this time. Hitherto they were unable to tell the difference between a proletarian and a bourgeois newspaper, between a socialist and a capitalist one. For some time the Rightists in charge ran these two newspapers as bourgeois newspapers. These Rightists hated the proletariat and socialism. They guided the universities not towards the proletariat but towards the bourgeoisie.

Is remoulding necessary for the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals from the old society? They are mortally afraid of remoulding, saying that it gives rise to a particular complex called the "inferiority complex", and the more the remoulding one undergoes, the stronger this complex. This view is wrong. The correct view is that the more the remoulding, the greater one's self-respect. If anything, the result should be a sense of self-respect since one has awakened to the need for remoulding. These people with their high level of "class consciousness" think they need no remoulding themselves, on the contrary they want to remould the proletariat. They seek to transform the world in the image of the bourgeoisie whereas the proletariat seeks to transform the world in its own image. I dare say the majority, that is, over 90 per cent of these people, will eventually bring themselves around to accepting remoulding after some hesitation, reconsideration, reluctance and vacillation. The more the remoulding one undergoes, the more one feels the need for it. Even the Communist Party is undergoing remoulding. Rectification means remoulding and it will continue into the future. Do you think there will be no more rectifications after this one? Will bureaucracy vanish after the present rectification? After only two or three years, some people will forget all about it and then bureaucracy will return. That's how people are, they have a short memory. Hence the need for rectification from time to time. Since the Communist Party itself is in need of rectification, can it be that the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals from the old society need no rectification? No remoulding? Certainly, they need rectification and remoulding, only more so.

Aren't the democratic parties in the midst of a rectification movement? All society should go through a process of rectification. What's bad about that? The rectification will deal not with trivialities but with important issues, with the question of political line. At present the democratic parties are putting the stress of rectification on the question of line and on repudiating the counter-revolutionary line pursued by the bourgeois Rightists. I think they have been correct. In its own rectification the Communist Party is now stressing not the question of line but the style of work. For the democratic parties, however, style of work is secondary and the main stress should be on what line they follow. Should they follow the counter-revolutionary line of Chang Po-chun, Lo Lung-chi, Chang Nai-chi, Chen Jen-ping, Peng Wen-ying, Lu Yi and Sun Ta-yu, or should they follow another line? First and foremost, they must get a clear idea about this and about

the three questions I am raising here: Are the achievements of the socialist revolution and socialist construction, the work accomplished by several hundred million people, good or not? Which road should we follow, the socialist road or the capitalist road? Which party should assume leadership in building socialism, the Chang-Lo alliance or the Communist Party? Let there be a great debate to thrash out the question of line.

There is also the question of line within the Communist Party. As far as those “insurgents”, the Rightists in the Communist Party and the Youth League, are concerned, it is indeed a question of line. At present dogmatism is not the question, for it has not evolved into a line. In the history of our Party dogmatism did become a question of line on several occasions, because it developed into a system, policy and programme. Present-day dogmatism has not developed to this extent, but it does have a certain rigidity which is now being somewhat softened by hammering and forging. Aren’t those in leading positions in departments and organizations, universities and factories “coming down the stairs”?² They are discarding the Kuomintang style of work and their uppity airs and no longer act like bureaucrats. Bureaucracy has greatly diminished now that directors of co-operatives work with the peasants in the fields and factory directors and Party committee secretaries join the workers on the shop floor. This kind of rectification will still be necessary in future. We should put up big-character posters, hold forums and deal separately with what should be set right and what should be criticized. There is another point. We should raise our level and learn some Marxism.

I believe most of our people are fine people and the Chinese nation is a fine nation. Ours is a nation which is very sensible, warm-hearted, intelligent and courageous. I hope a situation will be created in which we have both unity of will and liveliness, that is, both centralism and democracy, both discipline and freedom. There should be two aspects; not just one, not just discipline alone nor just centralism alone. That would muzzle people and prevent them from speaking up and criticizing what is in fact wrong. We should encourage people to speak out and there should be a lively atmosphere. Whoever criticizes us in good faith is not blameworthy. However sharp his criticism or severe his censure, he is not to be blamed or punished or given tight shoes to wear. Tight shoes are very uncomfortable. Now to whom should we give the tight shoes? The Rightists. The Rightists must be made to wear them.

We should not be afraid of the masses but should be with them. Some comrades fear the masses just as they fear water. Do you swim? I encourage swimming everywhere I go. Water is a good thing. If you put in an hour every day to learn swimming and keep it up, taking a dip today and another tomorrow, I bet you will learn how in a hundred days. First, you mustn't get a coach, second, you mustn't use a rubber tyre, as you won't learn if you use one. "But I fear for my life, I can't swim yet!" Well, you can first start in shallow water. Suppose you are to learn swimming in a hundred days, you paddle in the shallow water for thirty days and then you get the hang of it. Once you know how, it makes no difference whether you go swimming in the Yangtse River or in the Pacific Ocean, it is just water, the same thing. Some argue that you can't drown in a swimming-pool, because somebody will come to your rescue if you sink; but swimming in the Yangtse is terrifying, the current is so swift, won't you be lost for good once you go under? This is an argument some use to scare people. I say that's the way amateurs talk. None of our top-notch swimmers, none of our coaches and experts at the swimming-pools dared to go swimming in the Yangtse at first, but they do now. Don't people swim in your Whangpoo River here nowadays? The Whangpoo and the Yangtse are admission-free swimming-pools. Metaphorically speaking, the people are like water and the leaders at various levels are like swimmers who must stay in the water and swim with the current, not against it. Don't rail at the masses! In no circumstances must you do so. You mustn't rail at the worker, peasant and student masses and the majority of the members of the democratic parties and of the intellectuals. You mustn't set yourselves up against the masses, on the contrary you must always be with them. The masses may make mistakes. When they do, patiently reason things out with them, and if they refuse to listen, then wait for another chance to talk to them. But don't alienate yourselves from them, just as in swimming you don't leave the water. When Liu Pei got Chukeh Liang to help him, he said he felt "just like a fish in water". This is all true. Their fish-water relationship is not only described in fiction but recorded in history. The masses are Chukeh Liangs, the leaders are Liu Peis. One leads, the other is led.

All wisdom comes from the masses. I have always said that it is intellectuals who are most ignorant. This is the heart of the matter. Overweening intellectuals stick up their tails which are longer than that of the Monkey Sun Wu-kung. Sun Wu-kung can make seventy-two meta-

morphoses, and on one occasion he changes his tail into a flagstaff — that long. It's just terrific when the intellectuals stick up their tails. "If I'm not Number One Under Heaven, then I'm at least Number Two." "Who do the workers and peasants think they are? They're just block-heads! They can barely read and write." But the over-all situation is determined not by the intellectuals but ultimately by the working people, by their most advanced section, the proletariat.

Which leads which — the proletariat the bourgeoisie, or vice versa? The proletariat the intellectuals, or vice versa? The intellectuals must transform themselves into proletarian intellectuals. There is no other way out for them. "With the skin gone, to what can the hair attach itself?"³ In the past the "hair", meaning the intellectuals, attached itself to five "skins", that is, depended on them for a living. Imperialist ownership was the first skin, feudal ownership the second and bureaucrat-capitalist ownership the third. Wasn't the purpose of the democratic revolution to topple the three big mountains of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism? National capitalist ownership was the fourth skin, and the fifth was ownership by small producers, that is, individual ownership by the peasants and handicraftsmen. In the past the intellectuals attached themselves either to the first three skins or to the latter two and depended on them for a living. Do these five skins still exist? "The skins are gone." Imperialism is gone and its property has been taken over. Feudal ownership was liquidated and the land restored to the peasants, and now there is agricultural co-operation. Bureaucrat-capitalist enterprises were nationalized. National capitalist industry and commerce have been transformed into joint state-private enterprises and have by and large become socialist enterprises, though not entirely. Individual ownership by the peasants and handicraftsmen has been changed into collective ownership, even though the latter is not yet consolidated and will take a few years to consolidate itself. These five skins are no more, but they have a lingering effect on the "hair", on the capitalists and the intellectuals. These people can't get these skins out of their systems, and even dwell on them in their dreams. Those who came over from the old society, the old orbits, are nostalgic for their old habits and ways of life. Therefore the transformation of man will take a much longer time.

At present what kind of skin do intellectuals attach themselves to? To the skin of public ownership, to the proletariat. Who provides them with a living? The workers and peasants. Intellectuals are teachers

employed by the working class and the labouring people to teach their children. If they go against the wishes of their masters and insist on teaching their own set of subjects, teaching stereotyped writing, Confucian classics or capitalist rubbish, and turn out a number of counter-revolutionaries, the working class will not tolerate it and will sack them and not renew their contract for the coming year.

As I said here a hundred days ago, the intellectuals from the old society are now without a base, they have lost their former social and economic base, that is, the five skins, and they have no alternative but to attach themselves to a new one. Some intellectuals are now unsettled. Suspended as they are in mid-air, they have nothing to hang on to above and no solid ground to rest their feet on below. I say, these people may be called "gentlemen in mid-air". Flying in mid-air, they want to go back but are unable to because they find their old home, those skins, gone. Though now homeless, they are still unwilling to attach themselves to the proletariat. If they are to do so, they must make a study of proletarian ideas, have some feeling for the proletariat and make friends with workers and peasants. But no, they won't. They still hanker after what they know is gone. What we are doing now is persuading them to wake up. After this great debate, I think they will wake up somehow or other.

Those intellectuals who take a middle position should awaken and not be too cocky, because what they know is limited. I say these people are intellectuals and at the same time not intellectuals, maybe semi-intellectuals is a more appropriate term. For they have just so much knowledge, and on matters of principle they cannot open their mouths without making mistakes. Now let us leave aside the Rightist intellectuals, for they are reactionaries. The trouble with intellectuals who take a middle position is that they waver, do not have a clear orientation and sometimes even lose their bearings. If you have such great learning, how come you make mistakes? If you are so marvellous and cocksure of yourselves, how come you waver? A tuft of grass atop the wall sways right and left in the wind. It all goes to show that you don't know much. In this connection, it is the workers and the semi-proletarians among the peasants who know a lot. They can tell at a glance that Sun Ta-yu and his wares are nothing but fakes. You see who knows better? Undoubtedly it is those who can hardly read and write that know better. One must go to the proletariat when it comes to making the crucial decision concerning the over-all situation, the general direction. I'm the kind of person who consults the workers

and peasants before I do anything significant or make decisions on major issues, talking over and discussing things with them and with the cadres close to them to see if my ideas are all right. This makes visits to various places necessary. Staying put in Peking could be fatal. It is a barren place where you can't get any raw material. All the raw material comes from the workers and peasants and from the localities. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party can be likened to a processing factory, which uses raw material to turn out products. The finished products must be good, or otherwise mistakes are made. Knowledge comes from the masses. What does the correct handling of contradictions among the people mean? It means seeking truth from facts and following the mass line. In the final analysis, it is the mass line that counts. We mustn't alienate ourselves from the masses, our relationship with the masses is a fish-water relationship or swimmer-water relationship.

Do we need to finish off the Rightists with one blow? Giving them a couple of hard knocks is quite necessary. If we don't, they will play possum. Don't we need to mount attacks on these types and go after them? Yes, attacks are necessary. But the aim is to force them to reverse course. We should use every means in our offensive to isolate them completely, only then can we win over some, if not all. They are intellectuals and some are big intellectuals; once won over they can be useful. Win them over and let them do some work. Besides, they have done a great service to us this time as teachers who have educated the people by negative example. We are not going to dump them into the Whangpoo River but will still take the approach of curing the sickness to save the patient. Perhaps some are not willing to come over. If men like Sun Ta-yu are obstinate and refuse to make the change, so be it. We have a lot to do now. It is simply impossible to keep on hitting out at these types day in day out for the next fifty years! There are people who refuse to correct their mistakes, they can take them into their coffins when they go to see the King of Hell. They can say to him, "I'm a defender of the five skins. I'm a man of 'integrity'". The Communists and the masses grilled me but I did not submit and I have come through all right." But they should get this into their heads. Today there is a change of hands even in Hell, with Marx, Engels and Lenin ruling there. There are two Hells today, the rulers of the Hell of the capitalist world probably remain the same, while Marx, Engels and Lenin rule the Hell of the socialist world. As I see it, even a century hence the die-hard Rightists will get their punishment.

NOTES

¹ *Lieh Tzu*, "Tien Jui".

² "Coming down the stairs" refers to the efforts of those leading cadres who had committed errors to make self-criticism in response to the criticisms of the masses and to win their understanding during the rectification movement.

³ *Tso Chuan*, "The 14th Year of Marquis Hsi".

THE SITUATION IN THE SUMMER OF 1957

July 1957

During the period of socialist revolution in our country the contradiction between the people and the bourgeois Rightists, who oppose the Communist Party, the people and socialism, is one between ourselves and the enemy, that is, an antagonistic, irreconcilable, life-and-death contradiction.

The bourgeois Rightists who have launched wild attacks against the working class and the Communist Party are reactionaries or counter-revolutionaries. They are not so labelled but are instead called Rightists because, first, this will make it easier to win over the middle and, second, it will help split the Rightists and enable some of them to change and come over.

Those bourgeois Rightists who remain unchanged to the bitter end are die-hards, but they too will be given work and not deprived of their civil rights, unless they act as secret agents or carry on sabotage. This line of action is being taken because, judging from many events in the past, extreme policies produce bad results. We should take a long view, and decades from now when we look back on the present events we shall see how this treatment of the bourgeois Rightists profoundly influenced and greatly benefited the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

Our aim is to create a political situation in which we have both centralism and democracy, both discipline and freedom, both unity of will and personal ease of mind and liveliness, and thus to promote our socialist revolution and socialist construction, make it easier to overcome difficulties, build a modern industry and modern agriculture

Article written during the conference of the secretaries of provincial and municipal Party committees held in Tsingtao in July 1957 and printed and distributed at the conference. It was circulated among the leading cadres of the Party in August of the same year.

more rapidly and make our Party and state more secure and better able to weather storm and stress. The general subject here is the correct handling of contradictions among the people and those between ourselves and the enemy. The method is to seek truth from facts and follow the mass line. The derivative methods are those of holding meetings attended by both Party and non-Party people to discuss major policies, conducting the rectification movement publicly, and criticizing many of the Party's and the government's shortcomings and mistakes in the press. The rectification and the socialist education movement should proceed by batches and stages in the democratic parties, in the various circles comprising education, the press, science and technology, literature and art, public health, industry and commerce, and among the working class, the different strata of the peasantry, handicraftsmen and other urban and rural working people. With regard to the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals, the problem is to get them to accept socialist transformation, and the same holds for the petty bourgeoisie (including the peasants and the urban and rural self-employed working people), and especially the well-to-do middle peasants; but where the basic ranks of the working class and the Communist Party are concerned, the problem is to rectify their style of work. These are problems concerning two social categories that are different in character. This being the case, why is rectification used as a slogan for both? Because most people are receptive to this slogan. We can say to people: Since the Communist Party and the working class are undergoing rectification, do you think you can do without it? Thus the initiative will be completely in our hands. The method of rectification is to make criticism and self-criticism, present the facts and reason things out. The aim of rectification is to guide the struggle in such a way as to set right the political orientation, raise the ideological level, overcome shortcomings in work, unite with the broad masses, and isolate and split the bourgeois Rightists and all other anti-socialist elements. The bourgeois Rightists referred to here include those who have sneaked into the Party and the Youth League and whose political complexion is exactly the same as that of the Rightists outside; they have betrayed the revolutionary cause of the proletariat and launched wild attacks against the Party, and therefore must be fully exposed and expelled in order to preserve the purity of the ranks of the Party and the Youth League.

Firm faith in the majority of the masses, and first and foremost in the majority of the basic masses, the workers and peasants — this is our fundamental point of departure. Even in the case of industrialists

and businessmen and intellectuals, most people, who may have been deceived for a time and wavered during the period of the Rightists' frenzied attack, regained their bearings and came over to our side a few weeks later when the counter-attack against the Rightists started. Therefore, the majority in these circles are trustworthy in the long run, they can accept socialist transformation. At one time or another, quite a few comrades made the mistake of underestimating the strength of the proletariat and overestimating that of the bourgeois Rightists. There are still many cadres in prefectures, counties, districts, townships and factories who do so, and we should patiently persuade them not to underestimate our own strength and overestimate that of the enemy. In the countryside the landlords and rich peasants are being remoulded; some are still making trouble and we must heighten our vigilance. A great number of the well-to-do middle peasants are willing to stay in the co-operatives; a small number clamour to withdraw, eager to take the capitalist road. We should deal with each case on its merits. In the countryside it is imperative to pay attention to the class line and enable the former poor peasants and farm labourers to occupy the dominant position in the leading bodies, while at the same time pains must be taken to unite with the middle peasants. I'm all for a directive to be issued at once by the Central Committee to initiate a large-scale socialist education movement among the entire rural population to criticize Right opportunist ideas within the Party, the departmentalism of certain cadres and the capitalist and individualist ideas of the well-to-do middle peasants, and to strike at the counter-revolutionary activities of landlords and rich peasants. The criticism should be directed mainly against the vacillating well-to-do middle peasants whose capitalist ideas should be struggled against by arguing things out. From now on such struggle should be resolutely carried out once a year in co-ordination with the rectification movement among the district and township cadres and with the check-up of Class III co-operatives, so that all co-operatives may gradually be consolidated. In the countryside, let the peasants too have the "free airing of views" first, that is, make criticisms and comments. Then accept what is good and criticize what is bad. All this should proceed step by step in the rural rectification movement, which is to be conducted by the local cadres with the assistance of work teams sent from above. In the rural areas as in the cities the struggle is still one between the two roads — between socialism and capitalism. Complete victory in this struggle will take a very long time. It is a task for the entire transition period. In

the countryside diligence and thrift should be encouraged in running the household as well as in running the co-operative, and love of the country and the co-operative as well as love of the family. We must rely in particular on the efforts of the women's organizations to tackle the problem of running the household thriftily. Over the next few years, the annual sum of 35,000 million catties of grain in tax and of 50,000 million catties in state purchases must be obtained without fail. However, some adjustments may be made, depending on whether the harvest is good or poor. As production rises year by year and the number of grain-deficient households correspondingly falls, there should be annual reductions in rural grain sales. In cities, wherever grain sales are excessive, there should also be appropriate reductions. Only thus can the state increase its grain reserves each year and meet possible emergencies. Failure to collect these 85,000 million catties of grain will affect market prices, check the smooth fulfilment of the national economic plan as a whole and leave us helpless in the face of emergencies, and that would be very dangerous. Before the autumn harvest sets in this year, it is imperative to wage a struggle in the countryside against individualism and departmentalism, both of which ignore the interests of the state and the collective.

Counter-revolutionaries must be eliminated wherever found. Kill few, but on no account repeal the death penalty or grant any general pardon. Arrest and punish again those persons who commit fresh crimes after having served prison terms. Punish the gangsters, hooligans, thieves, murderers, rapists, embezzlers, and other felons in our society who undermine public order and grossly violate the law; also punish those whom the public identifies as bad elements. At present, certain functionaries in the judicial and public security departments are neglecting their duties and allowing persons who should be arrested and punished to remain at large; this is wrong. Just as over-punishment is wrong, so is under-punishment, and these days the danger lies in the latter. Prohibit gambling. Strictly enforce the ban on reactionary secret societies. Rightist student leaders should be thoroughly criticized; in most cases they should be kept where they are, to be reformed under supervision and to serve as "teachers". The above points hold good for the transition period, and it is the responsibility of the provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees to have them carried out. Subject to the policies and laws of the central authorities, local departments in charge of justice and public security and of cultural and educational affairs must act without fail under the

direction of the provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees and people's councils.

Our general subject is the correct handling of contradictions among the people. Keep on talking about it until it becomes familiar, then what once seemed bewildering will no longer be so. Clarify in your own mind the question of contradictions among the people, openly and clearly explain it, correctly handle a number of these contradictions, and then, having achieved results and gained experience, you won't be afraid of it any more.

Let me repeat. Correctly handling the contradictions among the people means following the mass line, which is consistently stressed by our Party. Party members should be good at consulting the masses in their work and in no circumstances should they alienate themselves from the masses. The relation between the Party and the masses is like that between fish and water. Without good relations between the Party and the masses, the socialist system cannot be established or, once established, be consolidated.

The armed forces have carried out rectification on many occasions; the Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points for Attention are enforced; democracy is practised in military, political and economic affairs; in times of war mutual-aid groups are organized in the squads; officers are integrated with men and the army with the people; and hitting or swearing at people is forbidden, and so is the execution of deserters. As a result, morale is high and our army is invincible. If this can be done among soldiers bearing arms, why can't democracy be practised in factories, villages, offices and schools and their problems (contradictions) solved by persuasion and not by coercion?

Why be afraid of our own people when we are not afraid of the imperialists? He is no true communist who fears the common people and believes the masses are not open to reason and must be coerced rather than convinced.

Except for renegades and persons who have grossly violated the law, we should protect all Party and Youth League members during the rectification movement, and make great and sincere efforts to help them correct their mistakes and shortcomings, improve their method of work, enhance their competence and raise their political and ideological level. A Party member must be full of vigour and strong in revolutionary will, be endowed with the drive to defy all difficulties and to persevere in overcoming them, and be determined to rid himself of individualism, departmentalism, absolute egalitarianism and liberalism;

otherwise, he is not a Party member in the real sense of the term. Those Party members who prove wanting in vigour and revolutionary will or who persist in their mistakes should be duly dealt with by the Party committee if they refuse to mend their ways after repeated warnings and, in serious cases, they should be disciplined.

Within six to twelve months the first secretaries (and the other secretaries too) of provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees should each make a personal study of a particular co-operative, factory, store and school to obtain some knowledge and earn the "right to speak" and so give better guidance to their work in general. The secretaries of prefectural, county and district Party committees should do likewise.

Don't underestimate the significance of our current criticism of the bourgeois Rightists. This is a great socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts. By itself, the socialist revolution of 1956 on the economic front (that is, in the ownership of the means of production) is not enough, nor is it secure. This has been borne out by the Hungarian incident. There must be a thoroughgoing socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts too. In the democratic parties and in intellectual and in industrial and commercial circles, it is of course out of the question for the Communist Party to exercise leadership over some people (the Rightists), for they are our enemies, and the Party's leadership over most people (the middle section) has not been consolidated; in certain cultural and educational units the Party's leadership has not been established at all. Firm leadership over the middle section must be established, and the sooner the better. The bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals do not gladly submit to the Communist Party, and the Rightists among them are determined to match their strength with ours. Once beaten in a trial of strength, they will realize that the game is up and their position is hopeless. Not until then will the majority (the middle section plus a number of the Rightists) begin to behave themselves, gradually abandon their bourgeois stand, come over to the side of the proletariat and make up their minds to throw in their lot with it. A small number will refuse to change to the very end; we'll just have to let them take their reactionary views with them to the grave. We must however heighten our vigilance. It must be realized that at the first opportunity they will again stir up trouble. Counting from now, this struggle will probably last ten or as many as fifteen years. The time can be shortened if things are well managed. Of course, this is not to say that class struggle

will cease in ten to fifteen years. As long as imperialism and the bourgeoisie exist in this world of ours, the activities of the domestic counter-revolutionaries and bourgeois Rightists will always partake of the nature of class struggle, and, what is more, they will invariably mesh with those of the foreign reactionaries. After a necessary period of time, the form of the present struggle should change from that of a strong gale and a torrential downpour to a gentle breeze and a mild rain so that ideologically the struggle can become deeper and more thoroughgoing. We have won the first decisive battle in the last few months, mainly in the last two months. But in order to win complete victory, several more months of deep digging are needed, and we must not wind up the struggle in a hurry. Make no mistake, if this struggle is not won socialism is impossible.

This great debate among the people throughout the country has solved or is in the process of solving questions of cardinal importance, such as whether our work in the revolution and in construction is correct (that is, whether achievements in the revolution and in construction are primary), whether the socialist road should be taken, whether the leadership of the Communist Party, the dictatorship of the proletariat and democratic centralism are needed, and whether our foreign policy is correct. It is natural that such a great debate should have taken place. It took place in the Soviet Union in the twenties (the debate with Trotsky and others on whether socialism could be built in one country¹), and it is taking place this year in our country, in the fifties. If we fail to win complete victory in the debate, it will be impossible to continue our march forward. Once we triumph in the debate, our socialist transformation and socialist construction will receive a big impetus. This debate is a great event of world significance.

We must understand that, counting from now, ten to fifteen years will be required to build a modern industrial and modern agricultural base in China. Only when the productive forces of our society have been fairly adequately developed over a period of ten to fifteen years will it be possible to regard our socialist economic and political system as having obtained a fairly adequate material base (now far from adequate), and will it be possible to regard our state (the superstructure) as fully consolidated and our socialist society as fundamentally built. It is not built yet, and ten to fifteen years more are needed. To build socialism, the working class must have its own army of technical cadres and of professors, teachers, scientists, journalists, writers, artists and Marxist theorists. It must be a vast army; a small number of

people will not suffice. This is a task that should be basically accomplished in the next ten to fifteen years. The tasks after that will be to make further efforts to develop the productive forces and expand the army of working-class intellectuals, create the pre-conditions for the gradual transition from socialism to communism and get prepared to catch up with and surpass the United States economically in eight to ten five-year plans. All members of the Communist Party and the Youth League and the nation as a whole should be aware of this task, and everybody should study hard. Wherever possible they should strive to acquire technical skill and vocational knowledge and study Marxist theory, so that a new army of working-class intellectuals will be formed (including all the intellectuals from the old society who take a firm working-class stand after having been genuinely remoulded). This is a great task history sets us. The revolutionary cause of the working class will not be fully consolidated until this vast new army of working-class intellectuals comes into being.

It is a major achievement that experience has been gained at the central and the provincial and municipal levels in the three tasks of rectification, criticism of the Rightists and winning over the middle section of the masses. With this experience things will be easier. The task for the next few months is to teach those at the prefectural and the county levels how to gain this experience. Between now and the coming winter and spring, the task is gradually to teach those at the district and the township levels to do likewise. In the cities it is to teach those at the district level and in factories and mines at the basic level as well as the neighbourhood committees. As a result, many people will be enlightened, the mass line will cease to be a mere phrase to them, and it will be easier for contradictions among the people to be resolved.

The first secretaries and all the other members of provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees must take full command of this great struggle. They must assume full control over the work of political transformation and ideological remoulding in the democratic parties (political circles) and in the circles of education, the press (including all newspapers and periodicals), science and technology, literature and art, public health, and industry and commerce. Each province, municipality and autonomous region should have its own Marxist theorists, scientists and technical personnel, writers, artists and literary critics, and first-rate editors and reporters on its own newspapers and periodicals. The first secretaries (and the

other secretaries too) should pay particular attention to newspapers and periodicals and not be lazy about it; each should read at least five papers and five periodicals for comparison, so that they can improve their own publications.

Our criticism of the Rightists has given a great shock to everybody in the democratic parties and in intellectual and in industrial and commercial circles. It should be noted that the majority of them (the middle) are inclined to accept the socialist road and the leadership of the proletariat. This inclination varies in degree with different categories of people; It should be further noted that although they now merely show an inclination towards a genuine acceptance of the fundamentals, namely, the socialist road and the leadership of the proletariat, this very inclination signifies the first step on their long journey from the stand of the bourgeoisie to that of the working class. After a year of rectification (from May this year to May next year), they will be able to take a big step forward. In the past they were mentally unprepared to take part in socialist revolution. For them this revolution happened all of a sudden. This was also the case with a number of Communist Party members. The criticism of the Rightists and the rectification movement will give these people and the broad masses a profound education in socialism.

The big-character poster can be put to use everywhere except in the salesrooms of stores, rural areas (districts and townships), primary schools, and the battalions and companies of the armed forces. In the conditions obtaining in our country, it is a form of struggle favourable to the proletariat and unfavourable to the bourgeoisie. Fear of the big-character poster is groundless. Big-character posters, forums and debates are three excellent forms for revealing and overcoming contradictions and helping people make progress in institutions of higher education, in departments and organizations at the central, the provincial and municipal, the prefectural and the county levels and in large urban enterprises.

At no time should production and other work be neglected during the rectification movement. The authorities in various places should not start rectification in all the units under them at the same time, but should stagger it and carry it out by groups.

Don't be afraid of the violent storm, toughen yourselves and bear it. In each unit, the crest of the torrent will pass in two or three weeks, and the unit can then switch to the new stage of counter-attack on the Rightists. Faced with the Rightists' wild attacks during these two or

three weeks, the leading cadres of various units should toughen themselves and hear them out without rebutting, concentrate on analysing and studying the situation, muster strength for the counter-attack, and unite with the forces of the Left, win over the middle, and isolate the Rightists — all this makes an excellent set of Marxist tactics.

The stage of freely airing views (carrying out reform at the same time), the stage of counter-attack on the Rightists (carrying out reform at the same time), the stage of putting the emphasis on reform (with a further free airing of views) and the stage in which everyone studies relevant documents and makes criticism and self-criticism to raise his own political consciousness — these are the four indispensable stages of the rectification movement at the central, the provincial and municipal, the prefectural and the county levels. In addition, rectification is to be conducted at the grass roots in the cities and the countryside. After such a movement, it is certain that the whole Party and the whole people will take on a fresh complexion.

The first secretaries of the provincial, municipal and autonomous region Party committees and of the prefectural Party committees are requested to devote some time in August to studying the check-up of co-operatives, production, grain, and other questions in rural areas in preparation for the plenary session of the Central Committee to be held in September. Please study the forty articles of the Programme for Agricultural Development one by one and see whether changes are needed.

NOTES

¹ *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*, Chapter 9, Section 5.

BE ACTIVISTS IN PROMOTING THE REVOLUTION

October 9, 1957

This conference has been a success. With the participation of comrades from the provincial and prefectural Party committees, such an enlarged plenary session of the Central Committee is in fact a conference of cadres from three levels and is good for clarifying policies, exchanging experience and achieving unity of will.

Perhaps it is necessary to convene this sort of conference once a year. For work is very complicated in a large country like ours. We did not call such a conference last year; we suffered in consequence and a Right deviation occurred. There had been a high tide the year before last, but last year saw a let-down. Of course we held the Eighth Congress last year and didn't have time. Next time such a conference is convened, a few secretaries of county Party committees and of district Party committees in some large cities may be included; for instance, it would be all right to have an additional hundred or so. I suggest every province should also convene an all-province conference of cadres from three or four levels, with some from the co-operatives, to thrash out problems. This is the first point.

Second, a few words about rectification. Be bold, thorough and resolute in letting people air their views and in making reforms. We must have this kind of resolve. Then, is it necessary to add a campaign against the Rightists, and a vigorous one at that? No, it isn't. Because the anti-Rightist campaign is on the right track and in some places has already ended. Now the stress should be on airing views and making reforms at the grass-roots levels, that is, at the three levels of county, district and township. In some departments at the central

Speech at the Enlarged Third Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

and the provincial and municipal levels, the airing of views should continue but the emphasis should be on reform.

In the course of this year the masses have created a form of making revolution, a form of waging mass struggle, namely, speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters. Our revolution has now found a form well suited to its content. This form could not have emerged in the past. Since we were then engaged in fighting, in the five major movements¹ and the three great transformations,² it was impossible for this form of unhurried debate to come into being. It would have been impermissible to devote a whole year to unhurried debate, to presenting facts and reasoning things out. Now it can be done. We have found this form, a form suited to the content of the current struggle of the masses, to the content of the present class struggle and to the correct handling of contradictions among the people. Grasp this form and henceforward you will find things much easier to manage. Major and minor questions of right and wrong as well as problems in revolution and construction can be solved through airing views and holding debates, and more quickly. The Left should freely air views and hold debates not only with the middle but also openly with the Rightists and, in the villages, with the landlords and rich peasants. Not being afraid of "losing face", we have published in our newspapers such nonsense as "the Communist Party monopolizes everything", "the Communist Party should abdicate" and "get off your sedan-chair". We have just got "on" our "sedan-chair", and already the Rightists want us to get "off". Speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters are the form best suited to arousing the initiative of the masses and enhancing their sense of responsibility.

Our Party has a democratic tradition. Without this tradition it would have been impossible to accept such free airing of views, great debates and big-character posters. During the rectification movement in Yen-an people took notes, made self-criticisms and helped each other, seven or eight to a group, and this lasted for several months. All those I have met are grateful for that rectification, they say it was only then that they began to shed their subjectivism. In the days of the agrarian reform, we consulted the masses whenever problems arose in order to straighten out ideas. In our army units, company commanders would personally see to it that their men were properly covered at night and would have friendly chats with them on an equal footing. Forms of democracy abounded in the rectification movement

in Yen-an, in the agrarian reform, in the democratic life of the army units, in the Three Check-ups and Three Improvements,³ and later on in the struggles against the “three evils” and the “five evils”, and in the ideological remoulding of intellectuals. But the free airing of views and the holding of great debates, to be followed by consultation and persuasion in the nature of “a gentle breeze and a mild rain” — it is only now that all this can come about. We have found this form which will immensely benefit our cause and make it easier for us to overcome subjectivism, bureaucracy and commandism (by commandism we mean striking or cursing people or forcing them to carry out orders) and for leading cadres to become one with the masses.

This year has seen a great development in our democratic tradition, and this form of speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters should be handed down to future generations. It brings socialist democracy into full play. Democracy of this kind is possible only in socialist countries, not in capitalist countries. On the basis of such democracy, centralism is not weakened but further strengthened, as is the dictatorship of the proletariat. For the proletariat must rely on its broad allies to exercise dictatorship, it cannot do so all by itself. The proletariat in China is small in number, some ten million only, and it must rely on the several hundred million poor and lower-middle peasants, city poor, badly-off handicraftsmen and revolutionary intellectuals in order to exercise dictatorship — otherwise it cannot. Now that we have aroused their enthusiasm, the dictatorship of the proletariat is being consolidated.

Third, agriculture. The forty-article Programme for Agricultural Development has been revised and will soon be issued. Comrades, please do a good job of organizing debates and discussions on it in the villages. I have asked some comrades whether prefectures should draw up agricultural plans. They said yes. Should districts do likewise? Again the answer was yes. What about the townships? Yet again they said yes. And the co-operatives too should draw up such plans. Then there will be six levels in all, provincial, prefectural, county, district, township and co-operative. Please take heed and lose no time in drawing up these agricultural plans. A plan and a programme are one and the same thing, and since we have been in the habit of using the word plan, let's call it that. We must persist in making comprehensive plans, giving more effective leadership, having Party secretaries pitch in and having all Party members help run the co-operatives.

Apparently not all Party members helped run the co-operatives in the second half of last year and Party secretaries rarely pitched in. This year we must persist in doing what we had done before.

When will the plans be ready? I've asked some comrades and learned that they are ready in some places and not quite in others. With stress now being laid on the three levels of province, prefecture and county, can their plans be ready this winter or next spring? If not, they must at all events be ready in the coming year, and at all six levels. For we have had several years of experience and the forty-article National Programme for Agricultural Development is almost ready. This programme and the plans at the provincial and other levels should all be discussed in the villages. But since it would be too much to discuss all seven plans at the same time, it is preferable to stagger the airing of views and debates by the masses. Here we are talking about long-term plans. What should be done if a plan turns out to be unsuitable? It will have to be revised after we've had a few more years of experience. For instance, the forty articles will need further revision in a few years. This is inevitable. I think they will probably need a minor revision every three years and a major one every five years. It is always better to have some plan than none. The programme covers a period of twelve years, and now two years have passed, leaving only ten; unless we grasp the matter firmly, there will be the danger of failing to fulfil the targets set in the forty articles for the yields of grain per *mou* for the three different regions, namely, four, five and eight hundred catties. Grasp the matter firmly and these targets can be fulfilled.

In my opinion, China must depend on intensive cultivation to feed itself. One day China will become the world's number one high-yield country. Some of our counties are already producing one thousand catties per *mou*. Will it be possible to reach two thousand catties per *mou* in half a century? In future will it be possible for the region north of the Yellow River to produce eight hundred catties per *mou*, that north of the Huai River one thousand catties and that south of it two thousand? There are still a few decades left before these targets are reached at the beginning of the 21st century, or maybe it won't take that long. We depend on intensive cultivation to feed ourselves, and even with a fairly large population we still have enough food. I think an average of three *mou* of land per person is more than enough and in future less than one *mou* will yield enough grain to feed one in-

dividual. Of course birth control will still be necessary, and I am not encouraging more births.

Please investigate how much grain the peasants actually consume. We must encourage diligence and thrift in running the household and economy in the use of grain so as to have reserves. When the state has a reserve and each co-operative and family has one too, we shall be quite well off with these three kinds of reserves. Otherwise, if all the grain is eaten up, what prosperity will there be to speak of?

This year there should be a little more accumulation wherever a good harvest has been reaped or natural disasters have not occurred. It is most necessary to make up for possible shortages with surpluses. In co-operatives in some provinces, in addition to the accumulation fund (5 per cent), the public welfare fund (5 per cent) and management expenses, production costs account for 20 per cent of the total value of output and capital construction expenditures in turn account for 20 per cent of production costs. I discussed the matter with comrades from other provinces, who said these capital construction expenditures were probably a bit too high. What I am saying today is to be taken as suggestions, which you may carry out if feasible, otherwise not. Moreover, it is not necessary for all provinces and counties to act in exactly the same way, and I leave the matter to you for consideration. The management expenses of co-operatives in some places have so far assumed too large a proportion and should therefore be reduced to 1 per cent. They consist of allowances to cadres of co-operatives plus administrative expenses. They should be cut and capital expenditures on farmlands increased.

The Chinese people should have high aspirations. We should teach everyone in the cities and villages of the country to have lofty aims and high aspirations. To indulge in eating and drinking, to eat and drink everything up, can this be considered a high aspiration? No, it can't. We should be diligent and thrifty in running our households and should make long-term plans. When people wear red or white, that is, at weddings or funerals, the practice of giving lavish feasts can well be dispensed with. We should practise economy in these matters and avoid extravagance. This is a matter of changing old customs. To this end it is necessary to argue things out through airing views in a big way, or maybe in a small way. Then there is gambling. In the past it was impossible to ban this practice, which can be changed only through the free airing of views and debate. In my

opinion, changing old customs should also be included in the plans to be drawn up.

Then there is the question of eliminating the four pests and paying attention to hygiene. I'm very keen on wiping out the four pests, rats, sparrows, flies and mosquitoes. As there are only ten years left, can't we make some preparations and carry out propaganda this year and set about the work next spring? Because that is just the time when flies emerge. I still think that we should wipe out these pests and that the whole nation should pay particular attention to hygiene. This is a question of civilization, the level of which should be significantly raised. There should be an emulation drive; every possible effort must be made to wipe out these pests and everyone should pay attention to hygiene. Progress is liable to be uneven in different provinces and counties, anyway let's see who is champion. China should become a country of "four without's", without rats, without sparrows, without flies and without mosquitoes.

There should also be a ten-year programme for family planning. However, it should not be promoted in the minority nationality areas or in sparsely populated regions. Even in densely populated regions it is necessary to try it out in selected places and then spread it step by step until family planning gradually becomes universal. Family planning requires open education, which simply means airing views freely and holding great debates. As far as procreation is concerned, the human race has been in a state of total anarchy and has failed to exercise control. The complete realization of family planning in the future will be out of the question without the weight of society as a whole behind it, that is, without general consent and joint effort.

There is also the question of comprehensive planning. I've just talked about agricultural plans, but there are also plans for industry, commerce, culture and education. It is absolutely necessary to make a comprehensive plan which brings industry, agriculture, commerce, culture and education together and co-ordinates them.

The cultivation of experimental plots is an experience worth spreading everywhere. The leading cadres of counties, districts, townships and co-operatives should each cultivate a small plot and experiment to see if a high yield can be reached and what methods serve that end.

We must get to know farming techniques. It is no longer possible to engage in agricultural work without acquiring these techniques. Politics and the professions form a unity of opposites, in which politics

is predominant and primary, and while we must fight against the tendency to ignore politics, it won't do to confine oneself to politics and have no technical or professional knowledge. Whatever line our comrades are in, whether it is industry, agriculture, commerce, or culture and education, they should all acquire some technical and professional knowledge. I think a ten-year plan should also be made here. Our cadres in all trades and professions should strive to be proficient in technical and professional work, turn themselves into experts and become both red and expert. It is wrong to talk about becoming expert before becoming red, which is tantamount to being white before being red. For in fact those who talk thus intend to remain white to the end, and becoming red later is just empty talk. Nowadays some cadres are no longer red since they have succumbed to rich peasant thinking. Some people are white, like the Rightists in the Party who are politically white and technically inexpert. Others are grey and still others pinkish. It is the Left who are really red, blazing red, like the colour of our five-star red flag. But being red alone won't do, one should have professional and technical knowledge as well. At present many cadres are only red but not expert and lack professional or technical knowledge. The Rightists say that we don't have the ability to lead, that "laymen cannot lead experts". We rebut them by asserting that we can. When we assert we can, we mean that politically we can. As for technical knowledge, we still have a lot to learn, and we will certainly be able to learn it.

The proletariat cannot build socialism without its own vast contingent of technicians and theoretical workers. We should form a contingent of proletarian intellectuals within the next ten years (the plans for the development of science also cover twelve years, and there are still ten years left). Our Party members and non-Party activists should all strive to become proletarian intellectuals. Plans for training proletarian intellectuals should be worked out at all levels, particularly at the three levels of province, prefecture and county, or else time will have passed with no such people trained. An old Chinese saying goes, "It takes ten years to grow trees but a hundred years to rear people." Let's subtract ninety from the hundred years and rear people in ten. It's not true that it takes ten years to grow trees, since it takes twenty-five years in the south and even longer in the north. But it is quite possible to bring up people in ten years. We have had eight years and if we add ten, we will have had eighteen years; it can be expected that by then a contingent of working-class experts with

Marxist ideology will have basically been formed. After that for another ten years the task will be to enlarge this contingent and raise its level.

Talking about the relationship between agriculture and industry, we should of course concentrate on heavy industry and give priority to its development; this is a principle about which there can be no question or wavering. But with this pre-condition, we must develop industry and agriculture simultaneously and build up a modern industry and modern agriculture step by step. We often talk about making China an industrial country, which actually involves the modernization of agriculture. The stress of our propaganda should now be on agriculture. Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping has also spoken about this.

Fourth, concerning the two methods. There are at least two methods of doing things, one producing slower and poorer results and the other faster and better ones. Here both speed and quality are involved. Don't consider just one method, always consider at least two. Take railway building for example. There should be several plans, so that out of several routes one can be chosen. There can be several and at least two, methods for comparison. For instance, should views be aired in a big way or in a small way? Should there be big-character posters or not? Which of the two is better? Questions of this sort are legion, but somehow no free airing of views has been allowed. None of the authorities in the thirty-four institutions of higher education in Peking have allowed this, or allowed it readily and unhesitatingly. For them this is a matter of drawing the fire upon themselves! To make them let people air views freely calls for plenty of persuasion and, what is more, considerable pressure, that is, issuing an open call and holding many meetings, so that they find themselves checkmated and "driven to join the Liangshan Mountain rebels".⁴ When we made revolution in the past, diverse opinions arose in the Party with regard to this or that method and this or that policy, but in the end as we adopted the policy best suited to the prevailing conditions, greater progress was made in the periods of the War of Resistance Against Japan and the War of Liberation than in the preceding periods. Likewise there can be this or that policy for construction, and here too we should adopt the policy best suited to the actual conditions.

The Soviet experience in construction is fairly complete. By complete I mean it includes the making of mistakes. No experience can be

considered complete unless it includes the making of mistakes. To learn from the Soviet Union does not mean to copy everything mechanically, which is exactly what dogmatism does. It was after we had criticized dogmatism that we encouraged people to learn from the Soviet Union, and so there was no danger. Since the rectification movement in Yen-an and the Seventh Congress, we have stressed learning from the Soviet Union, which has not only done us no harm but has proved beneficial. In revolution, we are experienced. In construction, we have just begun and have had only eight years of experience. In our construction the achievements are primary, but we are not free from mistakes. We shall still make mistakes in the future, but we hope fewer. Learning from the Soviet Union must include studying its mistakes. Having studied them, we need make fewer detours. Can't we avoid the Soviet Union's detours and do things faster and better? We should of course strive for this. In steel production for instance, can't we reach 20,000,000 tons in a period of three five-year plans or a bit longer? We can, if we make the effort. For this purpose we shall have to set up more small steel plants. I think we should run more steel plants that turn out 30,000 to 50,000 or 70,000 to 80,000 tons annually because they are very useful. It is also necessary to set up medium-sized plants with an annual capacity of 300,000 or 400,000 tons.

Fifth, several things were swept away last year. One was the principle of doing things with greater, faster, better and more economical results. The demand for greater and faster results was dropped, and with it the demand for better and more economical results was swept away, too. No one, I think, objects to doing things better and more economically; it is just doing things with greater and faster results that people don't like and some comrades label "rash". As a matter of fact "better" and "more economical" are meant to restrict "greater" and "faster". "Better" means better in quality, "more economical" means spending less money, "greater" means doing more things, and "faster" also means doing more things. This slogan is self-restricting, since it calls for better and more economical results, that is, for better quality and lower cost, which precludes greater and faster results that are unrealistic. I am glad that a couple of comrades have spoken on this question at the present session. Besides, I've read an article on it in the newspaper. Our demand for greater, faster, better and more economical results is realistic, in conformity with the actual conditions and not subjectivist. We must always do our utmost to achieve greater and faster results; what we oppose is only the

subjectivist demand for greater and faster results. In the second half of last year, a gust of wind swept away this slogan, which I want to restore. Is this possible? Please consider the matter.

The forty-article Programme for Agricultural Development was also swept away. These forty articles went out of vogue last year but are now staging a “come-back”.

Committees for promoting progress were swept away, too. I once raised this question: Are the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the Party committees at all levels, the State Council and the people’s councils at all levels — in short, the multitude of “committees” among which the Party committees are primary — are all these committees intrinsically for promoting progress or for promoting retrogression? They ought to be committees for promoting progress. To my mind, the Kuomintang is a committee for promoting retrogression and the Communist Party a committee for promoting progress. Can’t we now restore those committees for promoting progress which were swept away by last year’s gust of wind? If you all speak against their restoration and are bent on organizing committees for promoting retrogression, then, with so many of you for retrogression there is nothing I can do about it. However, judging from the present session, everyone wants to promote progress and there hasn’t been a single speech in favour of retrogression. It was the Rightist Chang-Lo alliance that wanted us to go backward. In those cases where things are really moving too fast and beyond proper bounds, temporary and partial retrogression is permissible, that is to say, we have to take a step backward or slow down a step. But our general policy is always to promote progress.

Sixth, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist road and the capitalist road, is undoubtedly the principal contradiction in contemporary Chinese society. Our present task is different from that in the past. Previously the principal task for the proletariat was to lead the masses in struggles against imperialism and feudalism, a task that has already been accomplished. What then is the principal contradiction now? We are now carrying on the socialist revolution, the spearhead of which is directed against the bourgeoisie, and at the same time this revolution aims at transforming the system of individual production, that is, bringing about co-operation; consequently the principal contradiction is between socialism and capitalism, between collectivism and individualism, or in a nutshell between the socialist road and the capitalist road. The

resolution of the Eighth Congress makes no mention of this question. It contains a passage which speaks of the principal contradiction as being that between the advanced socialist system and the backward social productive forces. This formulation is incorrect. At the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee we stated that after nation-wide victory the principal contradiction would be, internally, that between the working class and the bourgeoisie and, externally, that between China and imperialism. Though we made no public reference to this statement after the session, we have been acting on it ever since, because our revolution has developed into the socialist revolution and that is what we have been engaged in. The three great transformations constitute a socialist revolution, a revolution mainly in the ownership of the means of production; they have been basically accomplished. They have all been sharp class struggles.

In the second half of last year there was a slackening in class struggle, a slackening that was brought about deliberately. But once we allowed it, the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois intellectuals, the landlords, the rich peasants and part of the well-to do middle peasants started the attack on us. That was what happened this year. We allowed the slackening and they started the attack — that suited us fine, we gained the initiative. As an editorial in the *People's Daily* puts it, "The tree may prefer calm, but the wind will not subside."⁵ They wanted to raise a gale, a typhoon of some force! Well then, we started building a "shelter belt". This was the anti-Rightist struggle, the rectification movement.

Rectification consists of two tasks: one is to fight against the Rightists, including the fight against bourgeois ideology, and the other is to carry out reforms, which also entails a struggle between the two lines. Subjectivism, bureaucracy and sectarianism are all bourgeois phenomena — whose presence in our Party should be blamed on the bourgeoisie. Will it still be possible to blame it on the bourgeoisie a century or two hence? That would be rather difficult, I'm afraid. Will there still be bureaucracy and subjectivism then? Yes, there will but the blame will be placed on backwardness. In society there will always be the Left, the middle and the Right, and there will always be the advanced, the middling and the backward. By that time, if you are guilty of bureaucracy and subjectivism, you will be backward.

The rectification movement will go on till May 1 next year, there is that much time for it. Is there going to be a slackening again after May 1? I think yes. Can such a slackening be called a Right deviation?

I think not. Take a meeting for example. If it goes on and on, night and day for six months on end, I'm afraid many people will simply disappear. Therefore we should do our work according to circumstances, now speeding it up, now slowing it down. Last year we scored such a big victory that the capitalists beat drums and struck gongs to show their allegiance; if we hadn't allowed a slackening, we would have found it hard to justify ourselves, as there was no adequate excuse. We have said that the problem of ownership is solved basically but not completely. Class struggle has not died out. Hence slackening is not a concession in principle but is called for by the circumstances.

I think that the rectification should go on till May I next year and that it should stop in the latter half of the year. We shall see then whether there is any need for another rectification or another debate in the countryside and shall discuss the matter next year. Anyway, there must be another rectification the year after next. If we do not launch one then, or worse still, for several years, the old and new Rightists and the ones currently emerging will start wriggling again; besides, some elements to the right of centre, some middle elements and even some on the Left are liable to change. There are some queer characters in the world whose Right deviationist sentiments will surface and who will come forward with unwholesome comments and Rightist observations if you slacken for any length of time. It is also necessary to carry out constant education in our army units on the Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points for Attention. If you suspend it for a few months, morale will slacken. Morale should be boosted several times a year. Education should be conducted among the new recruits. Even the ideology of veterans and senior cadres would change without rectification.

A word in passing about our differences with the Soviet Union. First of all, there is a contradiction between us and Khrushchov on the question of Stalin. He has drawn such a black picture of Stalin, and we do not agree with him. He has made Stalin so terribly ugly! This then is no longer a matter that concerns his country alone, it concerns all countries. We have put Stalin's portrait up in Tien An Men Square. This accords with the wishes of the working people the world over and indicates our fundamental differences with Khrushchov. As for Stalin himself, you should at least give him a 70-30 evaluation, 70 for his achievements and 30 for his mistakes. This may not be entirely accurate, for his mistakes may be only 20 or even 10, or perhaps somewhat more than 30. All things considered, Stalin's achievements

are primary and his shortcomings and mistakes are secondary. On this point we take a view different from Khrushchov's.

Next, we also disagree with Khrushchov and his associates on the question of peaceful transition. We maintain that the proletarian party of any country should be prepared for two possibilities, one for peace and the other for war. In the first case, the Communist Party demands peaceful transition from the ruling class, following Lenin in the slogan he advanced during the period between the February and October Revolutions. Similarly we made a proposal to Chiang Kai-shek for the negotiation of peace. This is a defensive slogan against the bourgeoisie, against the enemy, showing that we want peace, not war, and it will help us win over the masses. It is a slogan that will give us the initiative, it is a tactical slogan. However, the bourgeoisie will never hand over state power of their own accord, but will resort to violence. Then there is the second possibility. If they want to fight and they fire the first shot, we cannot but fight back. To seize state power by armed force — this is a strategic slogan. If you insist on peaceful transition, there won't be any difference between you and the socialist parties. The Japanese Socialist Party is just like that, it is prepared for only one possibility, that is, it will never use violence. The same is true of all the socialist parties of the world. Generally speaking, the political parties of the proletariat had better be prepared for two possibilities: one, a gentleman uses his tongue, not his fists, but two, if a bastard uses his fists, I'll use mine. Putting the matter this way takes care of both possibilities and leaves no loophole. It won't do otherwise. Now the Communist Parties in a number of countries, the British Communist Party for example, only advance the slogan of peaceful transition. We talked this over with the leader of the British Party but couldn't get anywhere. Naturally they may well feel proud, for as their leader queried, "How can Khrushchov claim to have introduced peaceful transition? I advanced it long before he did!"

Besides, the Soviet comrades do not understand our policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend. What we want is to have a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend within the framework of socialism, within the ranks of the people and with the exclusion of counter-revolutionaries. Of course, realignment may take place among the people themselves, a section of whom may turn into our enemies. Take the Rightists for instance. In the past they were among the people, but now it seems to me that they are one-third people and two-thirds counter-

revolutionary. Shall we deprive them of the right to vote? On the whole, it is preferable not to do so, except for those few who are to be punished by law or reformed through labour. Some of them may even be allowed to sit on the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference, because anyway it is all right for the committee to have about a thousand people. In appearance the Rightists are still in the ranks of the people, but in reality they are our enemies. We openly declare that they are our enemies and that the contradiction between us and them is one between the people and the enemy, because they are against socialism, against the leadership of the Communist Party and against the dictatorship of the proletariat. In short, their words and deeds do not conform to the six criteria!⁶ They are poisonous weeds. A few poisonous weeds will always crop up among the people, no matter when.

Lastly, we should bestir ourselves and make arduous efforts in our study. Mark these three words, "make", "arduous" and "efforts". We must bestir ourselves and make arduous efforts. Now many of our comrades do not make arduous efforts, and some comrades devote their surplus energy after work chiefly to playing cards and mahjong and to dancing, and this I think is bad. We should devote our surplus energy after work chiefly to study and should make study a habit. What then should we study? For one thing, we should study Marxism-Leninism, for another, technology and for a third, natural science. Besides, there is literature, and especially the theories of literature, which leading cadres must know something about. They should also have some knowledge of journalism and education. In short, there is a very wide range of knowledge, of which we should get some general understanding. For we are supposed to exercise leadership over these matters! What kind of specialists can people like us be called? We can be called political specialists. How can we carry on without knowing about these matters and exercising leadership over them? All provinces have their own newspapers, which were neglected in the past, and their own literary and art journals and organizations, which were also neglected, as were the united front and the democratic parties, and as was education. All these things were neglected, and so it was precisely in these fields that rebellion erupted. But once these things were attended to, the whole situation changed within a few months. Lo Lung-chi asked, how could little proletarian intellectuals lead big petty-bourgeois intellectuals? He was wrong there. He says he is petty bourgeois but actually he is bourgeois. The "little intellectuals" of

the proletariat will do precisely that — exercise leadership over the big bourgeois intellectuals. The proletariat has had a group of intellectuals in its service, the first of whom was Marx, then there were Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and now there are people like us and many others. The proletariat is the most advanced class, it will lead the revolution all over the world.

NOTES

¹ The five major movements were the agrarian reform, the movement to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea, the elimination of counter-revolutionaries, the movement against the “three evils” and the “five evils”, and the ideological remoulding.

² This refers to the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce.

³ “The Democratic Movement in the Army”, Note 1, *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, Vol. IV.

⁴ Liangshan Mountain in Shantung Province was a rebel peasant base in the Sung Dynasty. Most of the rebel leaders in the classical novel *Water Margin* were forced to take refuge on Liangshan Mountain as a result of oppression by the authorities or despotic landlords. The expression “driven to join the Liangshan Mountain rebels” has since come to mean that one is forced to do something under pressure.

⁵ Han Ying (Western Han Dynasty), *Commentary on the Book of Songs*, Chapter 9.

⁶ See page 412 above.

HAVE FIRM FAITH IN THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE

October 13, 1957

A form has now been found for the rectification movement, namely, speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters. It is a new form created by the masses which is different from other forms employed by our Party in the past. True, there were a few big-character posters during the rectification in Yen-an, but we didn't encourage them. Nor was this form subsequently used in the Three Check-ups and Three Improvements. In the period of the revolutionary wars we received no pay and had no ordnance factories, what our Party and army relied on were the soldiers and the people in different localities, the masses. And so a democratic style of work has evolved over the years. But in those days there was no such form as speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters such as there is now. Why? Because we were then in the heat of war and the class struggle was very acute, and if we had allowed a free-for-all within our own ranks, that would have been bad. Things are different now. The war is over and the whole country except Taiwan Province is liberated. Hence this new form. New revolutionary content must find a new form of expression. Our revolution today is a socialist revolution, its aim is to build a socialist country and it has found this new form. This form can be speedily popularized, it can be readily picked up in a few months.

There are chiefly two fears when it comes to speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters. One is fear of disorder. Are you afraid of disorder? I think many are. The other is fear of not being able to get out of one's predicament. Those who serve as factory or co-operative directors, college heads or Party committee secretaries are all afraid that they won't

Speech at the Thirteenth Session of the Supreme State Conference.

be able to extricate themselves once views are aired or fires lit. It is easy now to convince people not to be afraid, but it was rather difficult in May. In Peking's thirty-four institutions of higher education the free airing of views was not allowed until after many meetings had been held. Why is there no need for fear? Why is the airing of views to our advantage? Which is to our advantage — airing views in a big way, or in a small way, or not at all? No airing of views is not to our advantage and airing views in a small way can solve no problems, therefore views must be aired in a big way. First, this will not bring on disorder and, second, it will not make extricating oneself impossible. Of course, the case is different with certain individuals, for example, Ting Ling cannot extricate herself, nor can Feng Hsueh-feng, who has lit a fire to burn up the Communist Party. They are only a handful and are Rightists. Other people need not worry, they should be able to extricate themselves. At most they have such faults as bureaucracy, sectarianism or subjectivism, and if they do, they need only correct them, so there is no ground for fear. The basic thing is to have faith in the majority of the people, in the fact that the majority are good. The majority of the workers are good, and so are the majority of the peasants. And so are most members of the Communist Party and the Youth League. None of them want to throw our country into disorder. Most of the bourgeois intellectuals, the capitalists and the members of the democratic parties can be remoulded. Therefore we need not be afraid, for there won't and can't be disorder. We must have faith in the majority, and by that do we mean 51 per cent? No, we do not, we mean go to 98 per cent.

The socialist revolution is new to us all. The revolution we carried out in the past was only a democratic revolution, which was bourgeois in nature. It only destroyed imperialist, feudal and bureaucrat-capitalist ownership, but not individual ownership or national capitalist ownership. Thus many people could pass the test of the democratic revolution. While some were not really keen on a thoroughgoing democratic revolution and barely managed to come through, others were willing to work hard for it and passed the test all right. The test now is socialism, and it is hard for some people. Take for example that Party member in Hupeh Province who was originally a farm labourer. For three generations his family had to go begging. Liberation brought him a new life, he grew well off and became a cadre at the district level. However, he complained bitterly about socialism and strongly disapproved of agricultural co-operation; he demanded "freedom" and opposed the state

monopoly of the purchase and marketing of grain. An exhibition about the life of this man has now been organized to serve as class education. He wept bitter tears of remorse, saying he would mend his ways. Why is the test of socialism hard to pass? Because socialism means destroying capitalist ownership and transforming it into socialist ownership by the whole people, destroying individual ownership and transforming it into socialist collective ownership. Of course, this struggle will go on for many years, and it is hard to say for sure right now just how long the transition period will be. The struggle this year is like a crest in the waves. Will there be such a crest every year like those in the Yellow River? I am afraid not. Nonetheless there will be some in the years ahead.

How many people are there today in the whole country who do not approve of socialism? Together with many comrades in the localities, I have made an estimate. It shows that about 10 per cent of our total population disapprove of or oppose socialism. The figure comprises the landlord class, the rich peasants, part of the well-to-do middle peasants, part of the national bourgeoisie, part of the bourgeois intellectuals, part of the upper stratum of the urban petty bourgeoisie and even a few workers and poor and lower-middle peasants. What is 10 per cent of a population of 600 million? Sixty million. That's no small number and should not be underrated.

There are two underlying reasons for saying that we must have firm faith in the majority of the people. First, 90 per cent of our people are in favour of socialism. This comprises the proletariat, the poor peasants who are the semi-proletariat of the rural areas, the lower-middle peasants and the majority of the upper stratum of the petty bourgeoisie, the majority of the bourgeois intellectuals and part of the national bourgeoisie. Second, among those who disapprove of or oppose socialism, how many are the worst die-hards, namely, ultra-Rightists, counter-revolutionaries, saboteurs, and those who, while not engaging in sabotage, are most obstinate and are likely to carry their ossified heads to their graves? Probably only 2 per cent. What is 2 per cent of the total population? Twelve million. Banded together and equipped with guns, these twelve million would make a sizable army. But why won't there be any great disorder in the country? Because they are scattered in different co-operatives, villages, factories, schools and branches of the Communist Party, the Youth League and the democratic parties. Since they are scattered all over the place and cannot band together, there won't be any great disorder.

What is the scope of the socialist revolution, what classes are involved in this struggle? The socialist revolution is a struggle waged by the proletariat at the head of the working people against the bourgeoisie. Though relatively small in number, China's proletariat has allies in vast numbers, the most important of whom are the poor and lower-middle peasants who form 70 per cent or a little more of the rural population. The well-to-do middle peasants make up about another 20 per cent. The present-day well-to-do middle peasants may be roughly divided into three categories: those who are for co-operation, 40 per cent; those who are of two minds, 40 per cent; and those who are against, 20 per cent. Education and remoulding in recent years has brought about a split among the landlords and the rich peasants, some of whom are no longer entirely opposed to socialism. We should also take an analytical approach towards the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals and not regard them all as being opposed to socialism, because that is not the case. Ninety per cent of our entire population are for socialism. We must have faith in this majority. Through our efforts and great debates we may win over an additional 8 per cent, which will bring the total to 98 per cent. The die-hards bitterly opposed to socialism are only 2 per cent. Of course we must be on the alert, because they are still a considerable force, as Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping put it just now.

The rich peasants are the bourgeoisie in the countryside where very few people listen to them. The landlords are still more discredited. The comprador-bourgeoisie has long been discredited. As for the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals, the upper stratum of the rural petty bourgeoisie (the well-to-do middle peasants), the upper stratum of the urban petty bourgeoisie (the relatively well-to-do small proprietors) and the intellectuals from these strata, they do have a certain influence. The intellectuals in particular are much sought after, they are needed in every sphere. Universities need professors, primary and middle schools need teachers, newspapers need journalists, theatres actors and actresses, and construction projects scientists, engineers and technicians. At present there are five million intellectuals and seven hundred thousand capitalists, or together almost six million. If each has a family of five, five times six million are thirty million. Comparatively speaking, the bourgeoisie and its intellectuals have a high level of education and technical know-how. That's why the Rightists are so cocky. Didn't Lo Lung-chi say that the little proletarian intellectuals are incapable of leading a big petty-bourgeois intellectual

like him? He insisted on saying that he is not bourgeois but petty bourgeois, a big petty-bourgeois intellectual. In my opinion, not only the little proletarian intellectuals but the workers and peasants who may know hardly any characters at all are a great deal wiser than Lo Lung-chi.

The Rightists and the middle elements among the bourgeoisie and its intellectuals and among the upper stratum of the petty bourgeoisie and its intellectuals are not reconciled to the leadership of the Communist Party and the proletariat. They say they support the Communist Party and the Constitution, in a way they mean it and their hands are raised in favour, but at heart they are not really reconciled. Here a distinction must be made between the Rightists who are hostile and the middle elements who are half inclined to be reconciled and half not. Aren't there persons who say the Communist Party is incapable of leading this or leading that? This view is not confined to the Rightists but is shared by some of the middle elements. In short, according to their argument, our days are numbered, the Communist Party has no choice but to move to another country and the proletariat to another planet. Because you are no good at anything! The Rightists say, you are not fit for any trade whatsoever. The main purpose of the current debate is to win over the half-hearted middle elements so that they will understand what the law of social development is all about and realize they'd better listen to the proletariat which does not have a high level of education and to the poor and lower-middle peasants in the countryside. Speaking of educational level, the proletariat and the poor and lower-middle peasants are not as good, but when it comes to making revolution, it is they who are really good at it. Can this convince the majority of the people? Yes, it can. It can convince the majority of the bourgeoisie, of the bourgeois intellectuals and of the upper stratum of the petty bourgeoisie. And also most of the university professors, primary and middle school teachers, artists, writers, scientists and engineers. Those who are not quite reconciled will gradually become reconciled, after some years.

With the majority of the people supporting socialism, the current appearance of the new form — speaking out, airing views and holding debates in a big way and writing big-character posters — is advantageous. This form has no class character. The Rightists too can use it. We are indebted to the Rightists for inventing the expression “in a big way”. In my talk of February 27 this year I didn't use this expression, I said nothing about speaking out, airing views and holding debates

in a big way. At a meeting here in May last year, when we talked about letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend, we were referring to “airing views” and “speaking out”, and in neither case was the expression “in a big way” used. What is more, letting a hundred flowers blossom was meant to apply only to the sphere of literature and art and letting a hundred schools of thought contend only to academic matters. Later on the Rightists called for extending the application to political matters, in other words, they called for the airing of views on all matters, for a “period of airing views”, and, what is more, they wanted them aired in a big way. It is evident that this slogan can be used by the bourgeoisie as well as by the proletariat; it can be used by the Left, the middle and the Right alike. Which class really benefits from this slogan of speaking out, airing views and holding debates in a big way and writing big-character posters? In the final analysis, the proletariat, not the bourgeois Rightists. The reason is that 90 per cent of the population don’t want disorder in the country, they want to build socialism. Of the remaining 10 per cent who disapprove of socialism or are opposed to it, many are of two minds, and only 2 per cent are dyed-in-the-wool anti-socialist elements. How can they possibly plunge the country into disorder? Therefore, in the final analysis, the slogan of speaking out and airing views in a big way, the form or method of speaking out, airing views and holding debates in a big way and writing big-character posters, benefits the majority of the people and helps them remould themselves. There are two roads — the road of socialism and the road of capitalism, and it is socialism that this slogan benefits.

We should not be afraid of disorder or of being unable to extricate ourselves. On the other hand, the Rightists will find it difficult to extricate themselves, although it will still be possible for them to do so. In accordance with dialectics, the Rightists will, I think, split into two sections. Probably quite a few of them, pushed by the general trend of events, will clarify their thinking, change their stand, behave themselves and not be so stubborn. When that happens, their Rightist label will be removed, they will no longer be called “Rightists” and besides will be given jobs. A handful of the worst die-hards may remain unrepentant to the end and carry the Rightist label to their graves. It doesn’t matter much, there will always be such individuals.

Since the Rightists stirred up trouble, we have been able to do some stock-taking: on the one hand, 90 per cent of the population are in favour of socialism, and with some effort we can make it 98

per cent; on the other hand, 10 per cent disapprove of socialism or are opposed to it, among whom the worst die-hards dead set against socialism account for only 2 per cent. With this stock-taking we know where we are. Under the leadership of the political party of the proletariat and with the majority of the people supporting socialism, we can use the method of speaking out freely, airing views fully, holding great debates and writing big-character posters to avoid such incidents as the one in Hungary and what is happening in Poland now. There is no need for us to ban a journal as was done in Poland,¹ all we have to do is to publish a couple of editorials in the Party newspaper. We wrote two editorials criticizing *Wen Hui Pao*. The first one was not thorough and did not hit the nail on the head, but after the second *Wen Hui Pao* set about correcting its mistakes. So did *Hsin Min Pao*. This could not happen in Poland, for they have not solved the problems of counter-revolutionaries and Rightists and of which road to take, nor have they put emphasis on the struggle against bourgeois ideas. Consequently, banning a journal touched off an incident. I think things are easier to manage in China and I have never been pessimistic. Didn't I say there wouldn't be disorder and we shouldn't be afraid? Disorder can be turned to good account. Wherever views are aired to the full, with the worst types howling and growling and great disorder following in their wake, things will be much easier to manage.

Before liberation China had only four million industrial workers and now there are twelve million. Though small in number, the working class, and the working class alone, has great promise. The other classes are all classes in transition, they all have to make the transition towards the working class. In the first step of this transition, the peasants become collective peasants and in the second step workers on state farms. The bourgeoisie will be eliminated, but not physically; the bourgeoisie will be eliminated as a class but remoulded as individuals. The bourgeois intellectuals need remoulding, and so do the petty-bourgeois intellectuals. They can be gradually remoulded and eventually transformed into proletarian intellectuals. Once I quoted the saying, "With the skin gone, to what can the hair attach itself?" If the intellectuals do not attach themselves to the proletariat, they will be in danger of "dangling in mid-air". Many people have now joined the trade unions, and some ask, "Aren't we members of the working class now that we are in trade unions?" No. Some have joined the Communist Party and yet they are anti-Communist. Aren't Ting Ling and Feng Hsueh-feng Communists who are anti-Communist? Joining a trade union does

not automatically make a person a member of the working class, for he has to undergo a process of remoulding. Members of the democratic parties, university professors, men of letters and writers have no friends among the workers and peasants. That is a serious drawback. Fei Hsiao-tung, for one, has over two hundred friends among the higher intellectuals in places like Peking, Shanghai, Chengtu, Wuhan and Wusih. He simply cannot break away from the group and, what is more, he has made a conscious effort to organize these people and has aired views on their behalf. That's the source of his trouble. I would ask, can't you change a little? Chuck your group of two hundred and seek another two hundred among workers and peasants. In my opinion, all intellectuals should make friends among the worker and peasant masses, where they can find true friends. Make friends with old workers. Among the peasants don't too readily make friends with the well-to-do middle peasants but seek your friends among the poor and lower-middle peasants. For the old workers have a keen sense of orientation and so do the poor and lower-middle peasants.

The rectification movement comprises four stages — airing of views, counter-attack, reform and study. This means the stage of free airing of views, that of counter-attack on the Rightists, that of check-up and reform and lastly that of studying some Marxism-Leninism and making criticism and self-criticism in the manner of “a gentle breeze and a mild rain” in group meetings. When “a gentle breeze and a mild rain” was first proposed in a document on rectification issued by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on May 1 this year, quite a few people, mainly Rightists, took exception to the idea and wanted “a strong gale and a torrential downpour”, which has turned out to be advantageous to us. This is what we had expected. For the same thing happened in the rectification movement in Yen-an; instead of the gentle breeze we had proposed, a strong gale arose, but in the end it was the gentle breeze that prevailed. When big-character posters appeared in their thousands in factories, people in positions of leadership had a tough time. For ten days or so, some wanted to quit or resign, saying they couldn't take it any more, couldn't eat or sleep. That was the case with the secretaries of university Party committees in Peking, they lost their appetites and couldn't go to sleep. The Rightists said they must have an unrestricted airing of views and no rejoinders. We too said we would let them shoot their mouths off and not answer. So in May we left them alone and did not come out with any refutation until June 8, and thus all views were freely aired.

Roughly speaking, more than go per cent of the views aired were valid and the Rightist ones were a tiny fraction. We just had to stick it out and hear them through before hitting back. Each organization has to go through this stage. The rectification has to be conducted in every factory and agricultural co-operative. It is now being carried out in the army. This is most necessary. If you skip it, the "free market" will expand. It is a strange world, for if rectification is allowed to lapse for three years, many queer arguments will crop up and bourgeois ideas will re-emerge in the Communist Party, the Youth League and the democratic parties, and among university professors, primary and middle school teachers, journalists, engineers and scientists. Just as one's house must be tidied up and one's face washed every day, I think rectification should, in general, be conducted once a year and last a month or so. Perhaps there will be crests again. We are not responsible for the current one, the Rightists are. Didn't we say that even in the Communist Party we had Kao Kang? Could it be that there wasn't a single Kao Kang in the democratic parties? I just don't believe that. Again, such types as Ting Ling, Feng Hsueh-feng and Chiang Feng have been found in the Communist Party, aren't their likes already found in the democratic parties too?

The bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals ought to recognize the necessity of remoulding themselves. The Rightists refuse to do so, and because of their influence some others are also reluctant to accept remoulding, claiming they have already been remoulded. Chang Nai-chi says remoulding is horrible, as bad as having one's tendons pulled out and one's skin torn off. We say one should cast off one's old self and he says that means having your tendons pulled out and your skin torn off. Now, who is going to pull out that gentleman's tendons and tear off his skin? Many have forgotten what our aim is, why we want to do all this and what is good about socialism. Why is ideological remoulding necessary? Because we want the bourgeois intellectuals to acquire the proletarian world outlook and transform themselves into proletarian intellectuals. The old intellectuals will be obliged to make the change because new intellectuals are coming on the scene. In terms of knowledge you can say that the new intellectuals haven't made the grade yet, but eventually they will. The emergence of these new forces will pose a challenge to the old scientists, engineers, professors and teachers and spur them on. We reckon that most can make progress and some can remould themselves into proletarian intellectuals.

The proletariat must build up its own army of intellectuals, just as the bourgeoisie does. The regime of a given class cannot do without its own intellectuals. How could bourgeois dictatorship be possible in the United States without its intellectuals? Ours is a dictatorship of the proletariat, and the proletariat must build its own army of intellectuals, including all those intellectuals from the old society who truly take a firm working-class stand after being remoulded. Probably Chang Nai-chi can be counted among those Rightists who refuse to change. When urged to make the change into a proletarian intellectual, he refuses, saying he made the change long ago and is now a “red bourgeois”. Well, let’s follow the method of self-assessment and public discussion; you can make the assessment yourself, but it has to be put to the public for discussion. We say you are not up to the mark, Chang Nai-chi, you are a white bourgeois. Some people argue for becoming expert first and red later. To be expert first and red later means to be white first and red later. Not red now but red in the future — if they are not red now, then what is their present colour? White of course. Intellectuals should be at once red and expert. To be red, they must make up their minds thoroughly to transform their bourgeois world outlook. They don’t have to read a lot of books, what they must do is to get a true understanding of the following questions. What is the proletariat? What is the dictatorship of the proletariat? Why is it that the proletariat alone has great promise while the other classes are all classes in transition? Why must our country take the socialist road and not the capitalist road? Why is the leadership of the Communist Party indispensable?

Many people take exception to what I said on April 30.² “With the skin gone, to what can the hair attach itself?” I said there used to be five skins in China. Three of them were old ones, namely, imperialist ownership, feudal ownership and bureaucrat-capitalist ownership. In the past the intellectuals depended on these skins for a living. They also depended on national capitalist ownership and on ownership by small producers, that is, petty-bourgeois ownership. Our democratic revolution was aimed at removing the first three skins and, counting from the time of Lin Tse-hsu,³ it went on for more than a century. The last two skins, namely, national capitalist and small producer ownership, were targets of the socialist revolution. All these five skins are now things of the past. The three older skins disappeared long ago and now the other two are gone. What skin is there now? The skin of socialist public ownership. Of course, this is divided into two parts,

ownership by the whole people and ownership by the collective. On whom do they depend for a living? Whether members of the democratic parties, professors, scientists or journalists, they all depend on the working class, on the collective peasants, on ownership by the whole people and on ownership by the collective, in a word, they live off socialist public ownership. With those five skins gone, the hair is flying in mid-air and it won't stay put when it comes down. The intellectuals still look with disdain on this new skin, they have a very low opinion of the proletariat and the poor and lower-middle peasants, who, they say, are as ignorant of astronomy as of geography, and they think that people of all "three religions and nine schools of thought"⁴ are not fit to hold a candle to them. The intellectuals are reluctant to accept Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism was opposed by many people in the past. The imperialists opposed it. Chiang Kai-shek opposed it, day in day out, saying "Communism is not suited to China's conditions" and making people afraid of it. It requires time as well as a socialist ideological revolutionary movement for intellectuals to embrace Marxism-Leninism and transform their bourgeois world outlook into the proletarian world outlook. The movement this year is meant to pave the way.

After the counter-attack on the Rightists, all is calm now in some departments, organizations and colleges; those in leading positions are having an easy time and are unwilling to carry out the reforms called for by the many correct criticisms put forward. Such is the case with some departments, organizations and colleges in Peking. In my opinion, there should be another high tide of airing views at the present stage of reform. Put up big-character posters and ask, "Why don't you carry out reforms?" Challenge them! This challenge can be very useful. The stage of reform should be allowed a little time, say, a couple of months. It is to be followed by a period of study, to study some Marxism-Leninism and to make criticism and self-criticism in the manner of "a gentle breeze and a mild rain". That will be the fourth stage. Such study of course is not simply a matter for a couple of months, what I mean is that people's interest in study should be aroused as the movement draws to a close.

The counter-attack on the Rightists will have to draw to a close. Some Rightists have anticipated this. The storm will be over sooner or later, they said. That's quite true. You can't attack the Rightists all the time, day after day and year after year. For instance, in Peking the air is not as thick with the dust of the battle against the Rightists

as before, because the counter-attack is nearly over. However, it is not quite over and we must not relax our efforts. To this day, some Rightists obstinately refuse to surrender, for instance Lo Lung-chi and Chang Nai-chi. I think we should try reasoning things out with them a few more times, and if they still refuse to be convinced, what can we do — call them to meetings every day? A number of die-hards will never mend their ways, and we will just have to give them up. They are only a handful, we'll leave them to their own devices and shelve them for several decades. Anyway, the majority will press ahead.

Are we going to throw the Rightists into the sea? No, not a single one. The Rightists are a hostile force because they oppose the Communist Party, the people and socialism. But now we don't treat them in the way we treat the landlords and counter-revolutionaries, and the basic indicator of the difference is that they are not deprived of their right to vote. Perhaps a few will have to be denied this right and made to reform through labour. Our practice is not to make arrests and not to deprive them of their right to vote but instead to give them some leeway, and this will help to split them. Didn't I say a while ago that the Rightists are of two types? Type one are those who, having mended their ways, will have the Rightist label removed and who may return to the ranks of the people. Type two are those who will remain incorrigible to the day they report to the King of Hell. They will say, "We are not the surrendering type, Your Majesty. See what 'integrity' we have!" They are the loyal servants of the bourgeoisie. The Rightists maintain ties and identify with the feudal remnants and counter-revolutionaries and act in concert with them. The landlords jumped with joy at that paper *Wen Hui Pao* and bought copies to read to the peasants and intimidate them. "Look here," they would say, "all this is printed in the newspaper!" They wanted to retaliate. Then there are the imperialists and Chiang Kai-shek who also identify with the Rightists. For instance, the reactionaries in Taiwan and Hongkong stand four-square behind Chu An-ping's allegation of the "monopoly of everything by the Communist Party", Chang Po-chun's demand for a "political planning chamber" and Lo Lung-chi's call for a "political rehabilitation committee". U.S. imperialism, too, is very sympathetic to the Rightists. I once put it to you, "If the Americans invade Peking, what will you do? What attitude will you adopt? What action will you take? Will you join the United States in setting up a puppet regime, or will you come along with us to the mountains?" I said then that my intention was to take to the mountains, first going to Changchiakou and

then to Yen-an. I was talking in extreme terms and considering the worst possibility — we are not afraid of disorder. Even if the United States should occupy half of China, it wouldn't frighten us. Didn't Japan have the greater part of China under its occupation? And didn't we fight back and create a new China? In conversations with some Japanese I said that we should thank Japanese imperialism for its aggression because it did us a lot of good by arousing the opposition of our whole nation and promoting the awakening of our people.

The Rightists are liars, they are dishonest and do bad things behind our backs. Who would have thought Chang Po-chun would do so many bad things? I think the higher the office these types hold, the greater their treachery. The Chang-Lo alliance was delighted with the two slogans, long-term coexistence and mutual supervision, and letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend. They used these two slogans to oppose us. We said we favoured long-term coexistence but they tried to turn it into a short-term one for us. We said we favoured mutual supervision and they rejected any supervision. For a time they ran amuck and in the end they got the opposite of what they wanted, turning long-term coexistence into a short-term one for themselves. What about Chang Po-chun's ministerial post? I'm afraid he can no longer keep it. Surely the people will not agree to a Rightist heading a ministry! Then there are some well-known Rightists who are deputies to the National People's Congress. What is to be done about them? I'm afraid it is difficult to keep them in these posts. For instance, Ting Ling can no longer be a deputy. In some cases, it may not be good if no posts or no jobs are given them. For instance, Chien Wei-chang can perhaps still keep his post as professor but not the vice-chancellorship. As for some other professors, perhaps they should not continue in that capacity for the time being because the students won't go to their lectures. Then what work can they do? We can assign them some other-jobs on the campus, let them reform themselves in the meantime and take up teaching again after a few years. All these questions need considering, it is a complicated business. Revolution itself is a complicated business. So I would like you to discuss the question of how the Rightists are to be dealt with and what arrangements are to be made for them.

How do things stand with the various democratic parties and at the grass roots? I'm afraid you who are in responsible positions haven't a very clear idea. For a time die-hard Rightists may have muddied the waters in some organizations so that we could not see to the bottom.

Investigation reveals that they actually account for only 1 or 2 per cent. Drop a little alum into the water and you can see to the bottom. The current rectification is like a dose of alum. After views are aired and debates held in a big way, we can see through to the bottom. We have been able to see through to the bottom of things in factories, villages and colleges, and get to the bottom of things in the Communist Party, the Youth League and the democratic parties.

Now a few words about the forty-article Programme for Agricultural Development. After two years of experience, the basic targets are still kept at four, five and eight, that is, an annual yield of four hundred catties of grain per *mou* north of the Yellow River, five hundred catties north of the Huai River and eight hundred catties south of the Huai River. This goal should be attained in twelve years, that's the essential point. Basically no change has been made in the programme as a whole with the exception of a few articles. Some questions have been solved, for instance, the question of co-operative transformation has been settled in the main, and the relevant articles have been revised accordingly. Previously some points were not emphasized, such as farm machinery and chemical fertilizer, and since big efforts are going to be made in these spheres, these points have now been stressed in the relevant articles. Some readjustment has been made in the sequence of articles. After due deliberation at the joint meeting of the Standing Committees of the National People's Congress and of the National Committee of the Political Consultative Conference, this revised Draft Programme for Agricultural Development will be promulgated for discussion throughout the countryside, as was its previous version. It may also be discussed in factories, various circles and the democratic parties. This draft programme put forward by the Chinese Communist Party was drawn up by our political planning chamber, that is, by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, and not by the "political planning chamber" envisaged by Chang Po-chun.

It is essential to get the entire peasantry to discuss this programme. We must enhance the vigour and enthusiasm of the people. Enthusiasm flagged in the second half of last year and the first half of this and then dropped further because of the trouble created by the Rightists in town and country. The rectification and the anti-Rightist movement have given this enthusiasm a big push. In my opinion the forty-article Programme for Agricultural Development is well suited to China's conditions and is not the product of subjectivism. There was some subjectivism in the programme, but we have eliminated it. Taken all

in all, there is great hope for this programme. China can be changed, ignorance can be changed into knowledge and lethargy into vitality.

There is an article in the programme about doing away with the four pests, that is, wiping out rats, sparrows, flies and mosquitoes. I'm very interested in this matter, I don't know how you feel about it. But I assume you are interested too. Doing away with the four pests is a big public health campaign and a campaign to destroy superstition. Eliminating them is not easy. To exterminate the four pests also calls for the free airing of views, great debate and big-character posters. If the entire nation is mobilized to do this and achieves some success, I believe there will be a change in the mentality of the people and the morale of the Chinese nation will be given a big boost. We must invigorate this nation of ours.

The prospects for the success of family planning are good. There should be a great debate on this matter too, and there should be periods of trial, expansion and popularization, each lasting several years.

There is much for us to do. Many things stipulated in the forty-article Programme for Agricultural Development need to be done. That's only a plan for agriculture; there are also plans for industry and for cultural and educational work. The look of our country will change when the first three five-year plans are fulfilled.

We estimate that the annual output of steel may reach 20,000,000 tons at the end of the Third Five-Year Plan. With output this year at 5,200,000 tons, the goal will probably be attained in ten years. India produced 1,600,000 tons of steel in 1952 and its current output is a little over 1,700,000 tons, an increase of only 100,000 tons or so in five years. What about us? Our output in 1949 was only 190,000 tons, it registered over 1,000,000 tons at the end of the three-year rehabilitation period, and now five years later it has reached 5,200,000 tons, an increase of more than 3,000,000 tons in five years. Five more years and our output may top the 10,000,000 mark or a bit more to reach 11,500,000 tons. Then, with the fulfilment of the Third Five-Year Plan, can we make it 20,000,000 tons? Yes, we can.

I say this country of ours is full of hope. The Rightists say it is hopeless, they are utterly wrong. They lack confidence; since they oppose socialism, naturally they have no confidence. We adhere to socialism and we are brimming over with confidence.

NOTES

¹ In October 1957 the Polish Government banned the weekly *Po Prostu*, which led to student riots.

² This refers to the address by Comrade Mao Tsetung on April 30, 1957 at a meeting of leading members of the democratic parties and democrats without party affiliation on the rectification movement and the ideological remoulding of intellectuals.

³ Lin Tse-hsu (1785-1850), Ching Dynasty viceroy of Kwangtung and Kwangsi Provinces during the First Opium War, stood for resolute resistance to British aggression.

⁴ In ancient China, the three religions were Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism, and the nine schools of thought were the Confucians, the Taoists, the *Yin-Yang*, the Legalists, the Logicians, the Mohists, the Political Strategists, the Eclectics and the Agriculturists. Later the "three religions and nine schools of thought" took on a broader meaning to indicate the different religious sects and academic schools. In the old society the phrase was also used to mean people in dubious trades.

A DIALECTICAL APPROACH TO INNER-PARTY UNITY

November 18, 1957

With regard to the question of unity I'd like to say something about the approach. I think our attitude should be one of unity towards every comrade, no matter who, provided he is not a hostile element or a saboteur. We should adopt a dialectical, not a metaphysical, approach towards him. What is meant by a dialectical approach? It means being analytical about everything, acknowledging that human beings all make mistakes and not negating a person completely just because he has made mistakes. Lenin once said that there is not a single person in the world who does not make mistakes. Everyone needs support. An able fellow needs the help of three other people, a fence needs the support of three stakes. With all its beauty the lotus needs the green of its leaves to set it off. These are Chinese proverbs. Still another Chinese proverb says three cobblers with their wits combined equal Chukeh Liang the master mind. Chukeh Liang by himself can never be perfect, he has his limitations. Look at this declaration of our twelve countries We have gone through a first, second, third and fourth draft and have not yet finished polishing it. I think it would be presumptuous for anyone to claim God-like omniscience and omnipotence. So what attitude should we adopt towards a comrade who has made mistakes? We should be analytical and adopt a dialectical, rather than a metaphysical, approach. Our Party once got bogged down in metaphysics, in dogmatism, which totally destroyed anyone not to its liking. Later, we repudiated dogmatism and came to learn a little more dialectics. The unity of opposites is the fundamental concept of dialectics. In accordance with this concept, what should we do with a comrade who has made mistakes? We should first wage a struggle to

Excerpts from a speech at the Moscow Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

rid him of his wrong ideas. Second, we should also help him. Point one, struggle, and point two, help. We should proceed from good intentions to help him correct his mistakes so that he will have a way out.

However, dealing with persons of another type is different. Towards persons like Trotsky and like Chen Tu-hsiu, Chang Kuo-tao and Kao Kang in China, it was impossible to adopt a helpful attitude, for they were incorrigible. And there were individuals like Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek and the tsar, who were likewise incorrigible and had to be overthrown because we and they were absolutely exclusive of each other. In this sense, there is only one aspect to their nature, not two. In the final analysis, this is also true of the imperialist and capitalist systems, which are bound to be replaced in the end by the socialist system. The same applies to ideology, idealism will be replaced by materialism and theism by atheism. Here we are speaking of the strategic objective. But the case is different with tactical stages, where compromises may be made. Didn't we compromise with the Americans on the 38th Parallel in Korea? Wasn't there a compromise with the French in Viet Nam?

At each tactical stage, it is necessary to be good at making compromises as well as at waging struggles. Now let us return to the relations between comrades. I would suggest that talks be held by comrades where there has been some misunderstanding between them. Some seem to think that, once in the Communist Party, people all become saints with no differences or misunderstandings, and that the Party is not subject to analysis, that is to say, it is monolithic and uniform, hence there is no need for talks. It seems as if people have to be 100 per cent Marxists once they are in the Party. Actually there are Marxists of all degrees, those who are 100 per cent, 90, 80, 70, 60 or 50 per cent Marxist, and some who are only 10 or 20 per cent Marxist. Can't two or more of us have talks together in a small room? Can't we proceed from the desire for unity and hold talks in the spirit of helping each other? Of course I'm referring to talks within the Communist ranks, and not to talks with the imperialists (though we do hold talks with them as well). Let me give an example. Aren't our twelve countries holding talks on the present occasion? Aren't the more than sixty Parties holding talks too? As a matter of fact they are. In other words, provided that no damage is done to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, we accept from others certain views that are acceptable and give up certain of our own views that can be given up. Thus we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes, one hand to struggle with him and the other to unite with him. The aim of struggle

is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one hand. The other hand is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to provide him with a way out, to compromise with him, which means being flexible. The integration of principle with flexibility is a Marxist-Leninist principle, and it is a unity of opposites.

Any kind of world, and of course class society in particular, teems with contradictions. Some say that there are contradictions to be "found" in socialist society, but I think this is a wrong way of putting it. The point is not that there are contradictions to be found, but that it teems with contradictions. There is no place where contradictions do not exist, nor is there any person who cannot be analysed. To think that he cannot is being metaphysical. You see, an atom is a complex of unities of opposites. There is a unity of the two opposites, the nucleus and the electrons. In a nucleus there is again a unity of opposites, the protons and the neutrons. Speaking of the proton, there are protons and antiprotons, and as for the neutron, there are neutrons and antineutrons. In short, the unity of opposites is present everywhere. The concept of the unity of opposites, dialectics, must be widely propagated. I say dialectics should move from the small circle of philosophers to the broad masses of the people. I suggest that this question be discussed at meetings of the political bureaus and at the plenary sessions of the central committees of the various Parties and also at meetings of their Party committees at all levels. As a matter of fact, the secretaries of our Party branches understand dialectics, for when they prepare reports to branch meetings, they usually write down two items in their notebooks, first, the achievements and, second, the shortcomings. One divides into two — this is a universal phenomenon, and this is dialectics.

ALL REACTIONARIES ARE PAPER TIGERS

November 18, 1957

When Chiang Kai-shek started his offensive against us in 1946, many of our comrades and the people of the country were much concerned about whether we could win the war. I myself was concerned. But we were confident of one thing. At that time an American correspondent, Anna Louise Strong, came to Yen-an. In an interview, I discussed many questions with her, including Chiang Kai-shek, Hitler, Japan, the United States and the atom bomb. I said all allegedly powerful reactionaries are merely paper tigers. The reason is that they are divorced from the people. Look! Wasn't Hitler a paper tiger? Wasn't he overthrown? I also said that the tsar of Russia was a paper tiger, as were the emperor of China and Japanese imperialism, and see, they were all overthrown. U.S. imperialism has not yet been overthrown and it has the atom bomb, but I believe it too is a paper tiger and will be overthrown. Chiang Kai-shek was very powerful, for he had a regular army of more than four million. We were then in Yen-an. What was the population of Yen-an? Seven thousand. How many troops did we have? We had 900,000 guerrillas, all isolated by Chiang Kai-shek in scores of base areas. But we said that Chiang Kai-shek was only a paper tiger and that we could certainly defeat him. We have developed a concept over a long period for the struggle against the enemy, namely, strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously. In other words, with regard to the whole we must despise the enemy, but with regard to each specific problem we must take him seriously. If we do not despise him with regard to the whole, we shall commit opportunist errors. Marx and Engels were but two individuals, and yet in those early days they already declared that capitalism would be overthrown throughout the world. But with regard

Excerpts from a speech at the Moscow Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

to specific problems and specific enemies, if we do not take them seriously, we shall commit adventurist errors. In war, battles can only be fought one by one and the enemy forces can only be destroyed one part at a time. Factories can only be built one by one. Peasants can only plough the land plot by plot. The same is even true of eating a meal. Strategically, we take the eating of a meal lightly, we are sure we can manage it. But when it comes to the actual eating, it must be done mouthful by mouthful, you cannot swallow an entire banquet at one gulp. This is called the piecemeal solution and is known in military writings as destroying the enemy forces one by one.

毛泽东选集

第五卷

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1977年（小16开）第一版

编号：（英）1050—2372

00440（精）

00340（平）

1—E—999(0)



