Refuting Another Top Capitalist Roader in the Party

The Victory of the People’s Communes and Bankruptcy of the Fallacy About “Going Beyond the Proper Stage Of Development”

In the course of the vast revolutionary mass movement for agricultural collectivization in China, its more than 500 million peasants have rapidly and step by step advanced from mutual-aid teams, elementary and advanced agricultural co-operatives to people’s communes. This is a great revolutionary undertaking without precedent in the international communist movement.

The people’s communes were born and have continuously developed in the midst of a fierce struggle between two lines. The course of that struggle has witnessed one victory after another for Chairman Mao’s proletarian revolutionary line over the counter-revolutionary revisionist line.

In the vigorous movement of agricultural collectivization, as Chairman Mao has said, “it is as if a raging tidal wave has swept away all the demons and ghosts. Now we can look at every member of society and see exactly who is who.”

Over a long period, another top capitalist roader in the Party working hand in glove with China’s Khruschev venominously vilified the establishment of people’s communes as “going beyond the proper stage of development.” By spreading this fallacy, he revealed his true colours as a counter-revolutionary opposing socialism and attempting to restore capitalism.

A Mask for Restoring Capitalism

His first absurdity was that in organizing people’s communes the pace was “too fast” and “the superiority of the advanced co-operative has not yet been brought into full play.”

It was by no means fortuitous that the people’s communes appeared in 1958. This was an inevitable outcome of the economic and political development of our country. It resulted from the Party’s rectification campaign, its general line for building socialism and the great leap forward.

The people’s commune movement began in a number of areas in the summer of 1958. Following the rectification campaign, the anti-Rightist struggle and the socialist education movement of 1957, the level of socialist consciousness and labour enthusiasm among the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants was higher than ever before. They were determined to transform the backward state of the countryside quickly.

As early as 1955 when the agricultural co-operative movement was at its height, Chairman Mao taught us, “... small co-ops have fewer members, less land and not much money. They cannot operate on a large scale or use machinery. The development of their forces of production is still hampered. They should not stay in this position too long. . . .”

Since the winter of 1957, and starting with the tremendous efforts to build water conservancy facilities, there was a large-scale advance in production and construction in the countryside. The advanced co-operatives, which were small and concentrated on agriculture alone, increasingly revealed their incompatibility as a form of organization with a rapid, large-scale expansion of production. The peasants in many places began to merge small co-operatives into big ones.

The general line for building socialism, namely, go all out, aim high and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism, was advanced by Chairman Mao and endorsed at the Second Session of the Party’s Eighth National Congress in 1958. It was a great inspiration to the revolutionary cadres and masses in the countryside and rapid progress was made in agriculture as well as in those branches of industry, communications and transport serving agriculture, and in rural trade, culture and education and in the development of the militia organization in the countryside.

Under these circumstances, the poor and lower-middle peasant masses demanded a more rational and efficient organization of labour power and, in order
to strengthen unified leadership, integration of the organs of political power and economic organization at the grass-roots level.

Thus a brand new social organization emerged in the vast countryside — the people’s commune which is large in scale, runs industry, agriculture, commerce, education and militia and integrates local government administration with commune management.

Our great leader Chairman Mao has the firmest faith in the masses, sets the greatest store by their wisdom and creativeness, is best at summing up their revolutionary experience and gives the greatest support to their initiative. He issued the great call “The people’s commune is good” and instructed that people’s communes should be formed step by step and in an orderly way as the basic unit of our society.

Chairman Mao also taught us that the movement for setting up people’s communes should be heartily welcomed and given more active and vigorous leadership.

The poor and lower-middle peasants boundlessly love the people’s commune. They praise it as “a giant who can move mountains and tame rivers,” “a golden key to hidden riches” and “a golden bridge leading to communism.” The people’s communes proved their superiority over the advanced co-operatives.

The advanced co-operative was an economic organization only, while the people’s commune is a unified political, economic, military and cultural organization. It can work more effectively in putting proletarian politics to the fore, consolidating the worker-peasant alliance, strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, ensuring the exercise of power by the poor and lower-middle peasants and turning the countryside into a big school of Mao Tse-tung’s thought.

The people’s commune is a much bigger collective than the advanced co-operative. It enjoys greater advantages in consolidating and developing the collective economy and preventing the polarization of the peasantry which would again throw the poor and lower-middle peasant masses into misery. The advanced co-operative only undertook farming, while the people’s commune runs a diversified economy with agriculture as the main task. The commune, therefore, is more effective in bringing about an all-round development of the productive forces.

Not only can the people’s commune engage in the transformation of nature, agricultural capital construction on a bigger scale and in rational planting, but it can also improve the management of farming, forestry, animal husbandry, side-occupations and fishery, go in for those branches of industry, repairing work and transport needed to develop agriculture, organize large-scale co-operation and undertake more efficient scientific experiments in agriculture.

This other top capitalist roader in the Party, however, babbled that “the superiority of the advanced co-operative has not yet been brought into full play” and attacked the people’s communes as “going beyond the proper stage of development.” He was, in fact, deliberately juggling with facts, maligning the people’s communes and openly opposing Chairman Mao.

When this top capitalist roader said the pace was “too fast,” he did not mean that the people’s communes would be all right if established a few years later. He was, in fact, fundamentally opposed to the rural areas advancing along the socialist road. At each crucial moment in the agricultural collectivization movement, this scoundrel who had always taken the stand of the landlords and rich peasants always came out in a vain attempt to hold back the wheel of history.

In 1955 when the socialist revolution in China’s countryside was reaching a new high, he collaborated with China’s Khrushchov in dissolving more than 200,000 co-operatives at one stroke. When agricultural co-operation made still bigger headway in 1957, he rushed forward to attack it, saying that it was advancing too fast. In 1962 when our economy met with temporary difficulties, acting in co-ordination with the class enemies at home and abroad, he did everything in his power to create counter-revolutionary public opinion for a return to individual farming. He clamourously demanded “legalizing” “the fixing of output quotas based on the individual household, the entrusting of responsibility for production to the individual household and the allocating of land to the individual household.” He publicized the absurdity that “black or white, if cats can catch mice, they’re good cats.”

This is ample evidence that his statement that “the superiority of the advanced co-operative has not yet been brought into full play” was nothing but a mask to cover up his sinister design to oppose socialism and restore capitalism.

Advocating Spontaneity and Opposing Socialism

This other top capitalist roader in the Party attacked the people’s communes as “going against the willingness of the masses” and being set up “in a drive of clamorous agitation.” He viciously attacked our Party for doing “something foolish.” But what are the facts?

Under Chairman Mao’s brilliant leadership the poor and lower-middle peasant masses are resolve in taking the socialist road. Just as Chairman Mao has pointed out, the vast number of poor and lower-middle peasants have an “inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism.” They have bitter hatred for the system of
exploitation because they were ruthlessly exploited by the landlords and rich peasants in the old days. After land reform, although their livelihood was better or even much better, many poor peasants were still in economic difficulties and many lower-middle peasants were still not well off. They were resolutely opposed to individual farming and were keen on taking the road of socialist collectivization. Some well-to-do peasants have a spontaneous tendency towards capitalism and take a vacillating attitude towards agricultural collectivization. But when effective political and ideological work is carried out among them, the overwhelming majority are willing to follow the Party along the socialist road. Only the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists are doing everything possible to undermine the socialist transformation of agriculture by our Party and are determined to take the capitalist road and drag our country back to the old semi-feudal and semi-colonial road.

Our great leader Chairman Mao said in 1955 that some people, “taking the stand of the bourgeoisie, of the rich peasants, or of the well-to-do middle peasants with their spontaneous tendency towards capitalism, always think in terms of the interests of the few and fail to think in terms of the interests of the whole country and the entire people from a working class standpoint.” This top capitalist roader in the Party acted in just this way.

The unprecedented people’s commune movement was based first of all on the high level of socialist consciousness of hundreds of millions of peasants armed with the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung. Led by the Party, the peasants in their hundreds of millions drew nourishment from Mao Tse-tung’s thought and greatly enhanced their socialist consciousness in the course of the mass movements for setting up mutual-aid teams and elementary and advanced agricultural co-ops. They firmly believed that only by taking the road of collectivization pointed out by Chairman Mao could they dig up the roots of poverty and prevent a return to the bitter past.

As soon as the general line of “going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism” was put forward by Chairman Mao and made public in 1958, the potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm of the peasant masses for socialism burst forth like a volcano and, as a result, the people’s commune movement rapidly swept the countryside.

Lenin said: “... at moments of great upsurge and the exertion of all human capacities, revolutions are made by the class-consciousness, will, passion and imagination of tens of millions, spurred on by a most acute struggle of classes.” This is an apt description of the people’s commune movement in our country. The swift and vigorous development of the movement is indicative of the fact that Mao Tse-tung’s thought is a spiritual atom-bomb of incomparable power. Once it is grasped by the hundreds of millions of the revolutionary masses, it turns into a mighty material force that transforms society and the world. With a high level of political consciousness, the broad masses of peasants brought the people’s communes into being throughout the countryside within a short space of time. This fully proved that the rise of the people’s communes was the logical outcome of social development and met the needs of the people.

Under the pretext of considering “the willingness of the masses,” this top capitalist roader in the Party was actually opposed to our Party imbuing the peasants with the great thought of Mao Tse-tung, and backed and fostered the spontaneous capitalist tendency in the rural areas. In fact, this was nothing but the theory of “spontaneity” advocated by the old-line revisionists. It is well known that scientific socialism is not generated by spontaneous mass movements, nor is Mao Tse-tung’s thought. Only by instilling Mao Tse-tung’s thought into the minds of the workers and peasants, can a mass movement be raised from the level of a spontaneous one to a conscious one, thereby advancing the revolution. In repudiating the theory of “spontaneity,” Lenin pointed out that all worship of spontaneity “... means ... a strengthening of the influence of bourgeois ideology upon the workers,” and “is ... tantamount to renouncing socialism.” These words of Lenin’s likewise expose the reactionary nature of the fallacy of “the willingness of the masses” peddled by this top capitalist roader in the Party.

Denying the Human Factor Means Betrayal of Mao Tse-tung’s Thought

The allegation that the people’s communes were “going beyond the proper stage of development” because China had not yet achieved agricultural mechanization was yet another fallacy advanced by this top capitalist roader in the Party. In his eyes, people’s communes could not be established, or consolidated, without mechanization.

This is sheer nonsense.

The prerequisite for running communes is not mechanization. The decisive factors are: the Chinese Communist Party personally founded and led by our great leader Chairman Mao; the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung, Marxism-Leninism at its highest in our era; the incomparably wise and correct proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao; our powerful state under the dictatorship of the proletariat led by the proletarian headquarters headed by Chairman Mao and with the great People’s Liberation Army as its mainstay;
and the socialist consciousness of the 500 million peasants nurtured on Mao Tse-tung’s thought.

Our great leader Chairman Mao quite some time ago refuted this reactionary fallacy of this top capitalist roader, which is nothing but a version of China’s Khrushchov’s reactionary theory of “mechanization before collectivization.” Chairman Mao said: “In agriculture, with conditions as they are in our country cooperation must precede the use of big machinery (in capitalist countries agriculture develops in a capitalist way).”

Can people’s communes be consolidated by mechanization alone?

Chairman Mao teaches us that mechanization is necessary for building our country and consolidating the communes, but revolutionization is far more important. That is to say, we must use Mao Tse-tung’s thought to educate hundreds of millions of peasants, use revolutionization to command mechanization and “grasp revolution and promote production.” “Grasp class struggle and all problems can be solved.” The continual consolidation and development of the people’s communes in our country is precisely the outcome of the fact that the revolutionary cadres and masses in the rural areas have put proletarian politics to the fore, held high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung’s thought, continuously strengthened and consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat and promoted the revolutionization of people’s thinking. This top capitalist roader in the Party, however, used machines to oppose politics and used mechanization to oppose revolutionization. This shows up his ugly features as an out-and-out counter-revolutionary revisionist.

This top capitalist roader in the Party also tried to make people believe in the omnipotence of mechanization. But this attempt is doomed to failure in the face of the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung. Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung’s thought, always holds that among the various factors in the productive forces, man is the decisive one. This is because machines are made and used by man. Without man there is no machinery, without man machines can do nothing. Machinery is nothing more than an extension of man’s organs. All kinds of machines are, in fact, built to replace men’s hands, to render assistance to them and to strengthen them. Machinery, therefore, is only a potential productive force and can be transformed into an actual productive force only when it is combined with man. Machinery alone is merely a heap of metal.

Chairman Mao has said: “The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.” “Of all things in the world, people are the most precious. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, as long as there are people, every kind of miracle can be performed.” With ulterior motives, this top capitalist roader in the Party stressed only the importance of machinery and mechanization but said nothing about the great revolutionary role of the masses of the people in the development of history. In this way, he fundamentally betrays Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung’s thought. His absurd contention was the same as the notorious counter-revolutionary “theory of productive forces” dished up by his revisionist predecessors Bernstein, Kautsky, Bukharin and their like. This is an out-and-out counter-revolutionary revisionist theory which was long ago refuted by history.

The history of all revolutions has proved: Though a revolution in the relations of production is caused by the development of the productive forces to a certain extent, a great development of the productive forces is impossible until a change occurs in the relations of production. In Britain, for instance, the bourgeois revolution which broke out in the 17th century gave impetus to the further development of capitalist relations of production. But it was not until the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century that the industrial revolution took place. Events in the Soviet Union followed this pattern too. Under the leadership of Stalin, agricultural collectivization was in the main brought about between 1930 and 1932, though the acreage of tractor-ploughed land at that time was less than 20 per cent of the land under cultivation.

The reactionary “theory of productive forces” is a thread-bare flag hoisted by both old-line and modern revisionists to oppose the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In total disregard of the iron-clad historical facts, this top capitalist roader in the Party slandered the people’s communes as “going beyond the proper stage of development.” The reactionary nature of this lies in opposing the revolution, attempting to turn the people’s communes back into small, individual peasant economies and thus restoring capitalism in the countryside.

The people’s communes in China have a history of nearly 10 years. In this short period, they are like the radiant red sun “full of youth and vitality, sweeping the world with the momentum of an avalanche and the force of a thunderbolt.” This top capitalist roader’s reactionary fallacy about the people’s communes “going beyond the proper stage of development” has gone totally bankrupt and he himself has been thrown aside by the mighty army of the proletarian cultural revolution hundreds of millions strong.

(An abridged translation of the original article published in “Renmin Ribao” and written by the proletarian revolutionaries of the organs directly under the Science and Technology Commission for National Defence)