TENG Hsiao-ping, the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party, pushed a revisionist programme and a revisionist line and took the lead in stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts. He not only spread a lot of weird nonsense in the various spheres of the superstructure but also came out against Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line in the economic field. On the pretext of "everything for modernization," he meddled in industrial and transport work, personally ordering the drafting of a set of so-called regulations for industrial development and peddling his sinister revisionist junk in a vain attempt to make socialist industry his basis for a capitalist restoration. Although his tactics were very deceptive, they failed to delude the workers who have been tempered in the Great Cultural Revolution and in the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius. As soon as his revisionist stuff was trotted out, it was rejected and criticized by the broad masses of workers and cadres. The struggle personally initiated and led by Chairman Mao to beat back the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts has further heightened the revolutionary fighting will of the workers. Through this struggle, they have come to see more clearly the reactionary nature of Teng Hsiao-ping's revisionist line.

What Is the Main Danger on the Industrial And Transport Front?

In his drive for retrogression and restoration, Teng Hsiao-ping trumpeted "taking the three directives as the key link," spared no effort to deny that the principal contradiction on the industrial and transport front is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and opposed taking class struggle as the key link. In his view, the main danger at present lay in "not daring to say grasp production," which was of "a universal nature." He openly negated the commanding role of the Party's basic line in industry and transport and tried in this way to divert industrial development from its socialist orientation.

Since 1949 Chairman Mao has consistently emphasized: "The principal contradiction within the country is one between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie." It also is the principal contradiction on the industrial and transport front. Owing to the existence and development of this contradiction, the universal problem on this front will, for a considerably long period of time to come, continue to be a question of whether to take the socialist road or the capitalist road and whether the leadership is in the hands of Marxists and the masses of workers or in the hands of the bourgeoisie and capitalist-roaders within the Party. The main danger is revisionism and capitalist restoration. Analysing the necessity for the Great Cultural Revolution at the First Plenary Session of the Party's Ninth Central Committee, Chairman Mao pointed out: "Apparently, we couldn't do without the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, for our base was not solid. From my observations, I am afraid that in a fairly large majority of factories — I don't mean all or the overwhelming majority — leadership was not in the hands of real Marxists and the masses of workers. Not that there were no good people in the leadership of the factories. There were. There were good people among the secretaries, deputy secretaries and members of Party committees and among the Party branch secretaries. But they followed that line of Liu Shaorqi's, just resorting to material incentive, putting profit in command and, instead of promoting proletarian politics, handing out bonuses, and so forth." "But there are indeed bad people in the factories." "This shows that the revolution is still unfinished." On the industrial and transport front, the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will not come to an end until all classes are abolished. The old bourgeoisie still exists and intellectuals who have not remoulded their world outlook still exist; corruption, theft of public property and speculation sometimes occur; and the existence of bourgeois right is still giving rise to new bourgeois elements. The revisionist line in running enterprises — the putting of profits in command, material incentives, bonuses, and so forth — still has a market and the situation in which the capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road will remain for a long time to come. Teng Hsiao-ping's attempt to deny class struggle on the industrial and transport front was aimed at covering up his struggle against the proletariat on behalf of the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party, his pushing the revisionist line and taking the capitalist road.
Under the socialist system, factories and enterprises are battlefields where the proletariat wages class struggle against the bourgeoisie. We must never regard a factory as a purely economic organization and follow the theory of productive forces in running it. Chairman Mao has said: “Unite for one purpose, that is, the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This must be fully achieved in every factory, village, office and school.” Only by consolidating the proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie and constantly improving the socialist relations of production is it possible to develop socialist production with greater, faster, better and more economical results and make factories and enterprises strong bastions for combating and preventing revisionism. If the factories and enterprises lose sight of the goal of consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and go in for production eschewing class struggle, they not only would be unable to develop production for building socialism, but would become the soil for engendering the bourgeoisie and capitalism. Should this be allowed to develop, the socialist ownership of the factories would turn into capitalist ownership and the workers would again become hired slaves. When Teng Hsiao-ping clamoured for “daring to say grasp production,” he did not really mean to develop socialist production; what he aimed at was to induce people to give up the factories and enterprises as battlefields of class struggle and relinquish the proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie so that he could restore capitalism with ease.

Of course socialist industrial enterprises must strive to fulfill and overfulfill their production plans and constantly solve such problems as maintenance of equipment, technical innovations and quality of products. But solutions of these problems also cannot be separated from the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Chairman Mao has said: “Class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it.” Only by taking class struggle as the key link, deepening the criticism of revisionism and capitalism and continually solving the question of which line and which road to follow can socialist production develop in the right direction and with greater impetus; only thus can all production problems including equipment, techniques and quality be really solved in the correct way and only thus can we take our own road to develop industry with greater, faster, better and more economical results, rapidly establish an independent and fairly comprehensive industrial system and realize the modernization of socialist industry. Opposing the taking of class struggle as the key link, Teng Hsiao-ping stuck to the theme of “white cat, black cat” and made no distinction between Marxism and imperialism. This will inevitably lead to the capitalist road and undermine socialist production. What he termed “modernization” was in effect carrying out capitalist modernization in the interest of the bourgeoisie and turning China into an economic appendage of imperialism and social-imperialism.

Why Harp on the Old Tunes of Putting Profits In Command and Material Incentives?

An important aspect in the class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie on the industrial and transport front is the criticism of revisionist wares such as putting profits in command and material incentives. Since the Great Cultural Revolution started, the broad masses of workers have not relaxed their criticism of such trash, and this made Teng Hsiao-ping fuming with rage. He vilified the criticism of putting profits in command as “one-sided opposition to the making of profits.” He babbled: “You say it’s putting profits in command, well, a bit of profit in command doesn’t matter much. Otherwise, what is the state to rely on?” He flagrantly opposed criticizing material incentives and made no secret of his advocacy of revisionism.

Why does our socialist country under the proletarian dictatorship run industry and economic undertakings? Why do factories produce and the workers work? Is it for profits, for money? Or is it for the revolution, for the people? It is imperative to make this clear. Chairman Mao has said: “The general policy guiding our economic and financial work is to develop the economy and ensure supplies.” (Economic and Financial Problems in the Anti-Japanese War.) Our aim in developing production in all light and heavy industries is solely to ensure supplies, to meet the needs of socialist revolution and socialist construction and the needs of the people in their work and life, to “be prepared against war, be prepared against natural disasters, and do everything for the people.” This is linked with the consolidation of the worker-peasant alliance, the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship and the lofty goal ahead of realizing communism. For the revolution and for the people—this is the fundamental criterion distinguishing socialist production from capitalist production. The basic objective of the capitalists in setting up factories and enterprises is to extract maximum profits. The mission of the bourgeoisie society is to make money. Marx said: “Production of surplus-value is the absolute law of this mode of production.” (Capital.) In advocating putting profits in command and material incentives and writing off the fundamental difference between socialism and capitalism, Teng Hsiao-ping once again exposed his reactionary bourgeois stand and world outlook.

Putting profits in command and material incentives are all about money and material things; in essence, they are a form of bourgeois politics and a corrosive the bourgeoisie uses to corrupt our cadres and the masses.
and to undermine the socialist relations of production. How can it be said that it “doesn’t matter much” to peddle such rubbish in socialist factories and enterprises? Socialist economy is a planned economy; it develops proportionately and according to plan. What and how much products a factory produces and what it does not produce are all determined by an overall plan and must be in the people’s interests. If every factory puts profits in command anddevotes great efforts to turning out products that bring in the most profits while paying scant heed to making products that are less profitable and not producing things which do not bring in any profit, wouldn’t this upset and sabotage the socialist planned economy and bring on anarchy in production? In their pursuit of profits, the various enterprises will seek their own interests at the expense of others, and socialist co-operation will be turned into capitalist competition. Putting profits in command, striving one-sidedly for output value and profits, praying to “Marshal Chao,” the God of Wealth, handing out bonuses and using material incentives to stimulate people’s enthusiasm will inevitably corrupt the thinking of cadres and the masses, undermine unity among workers, lead people astray to think only of personal gains or losses and scramble for fame and position, and turn the relations among people into mercenary, cash relations. In this way, socialist relations of production will be destroyed and bourgeois right will grow to malignant proportions. If this is allowed to continue, a restoration of capitalist ownership will inevitably result. Soviet social-imperialism is a case in point and, like a mirror, it shows up in perspective the insidious designs of Teng Hsiao-ping.

To meet the needs of revolution and construction, it is necessary for socialist enterprises to calculate production costs, have economic accounting and, according to state requirements, make profits as planned. The profits earned by socialist enterprises constitute the main source of socialist accumulation. We have always attached importance to economic accounting and accumulation and opposed such erroneous ideas as not estimating the cost, neglecting accumulation and being extravagant and wasteful. Teng Hsiao-ping, however, attacked the criticism of putting profits in command and material incentives as “one-sided opposition to the making of profits”; he did this for the sole purpose of deliberately creating confusion and with ulterior motives. Since the start of the Great Cultural Revolution, the enthusiasm of the broad masses of workers has been aroused precisely because criticism was carried out against these revisionist things. The workers have conscientiously implemented the Party’s line, policies and principles and carried out state plans and accumulated more and more funds for socialist revolution and socialist construction.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: “Ideological work and political work are the guarantee for accomplishing economic work and technical work, and they serve the economic base. Moreover, ideology and politics are the commander, the soul. If our ideological work and political work slacken just a little, economic work and technical work are bound to go astray.” To develop production, our socialist state does not rely on putting profits in command or material incentives but on Chairman Mao’s proletarian revolutionary line, on putting proletarian politics in command, on taking class struggle as the key link and on powerful political and ideological work. This is fundamental in running the socialist enterprises well.

Rely on the Working Class or on the Bourgeoisie?

To take class struggle as the key link in running industry, it is imperative to rely on the working class wholeheartedly, bring into full play the masses’ enthusiasm for building socialism and launch mass movements on a large scale. This is Chairman Mao’s consistent thinking and is a truth proved in practice. Contrary to this, Teng Hsiao-ping babbled that “relying on the workers, peasants and soldiers is only relative” and he opposed relying on the working class. On the one hand, he again peddled the old system of keeping the workers bound, hand and foot with all sorts of restrictions and taboos and placing enterprises under the direct and exclusive control of ministries concerned, which stifled the masses’ enthusiasm for building socialism. On the other hand, he advocated letting specialists run the factories, propagated servility to things foreign and prostrated himself before domestic and foreign bourgeois “authorities,” casting himself in the role of a big bourgeois comprador.

An important issue in the struggle between the two classes and the two lines is whether or not to have faith in the masses of workers and rely on them. Chairman Mao has pointed out that the working class is the leading class and “is most far-sighted, most selfless and most thoroughly revolutionary.” (On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship.) If faith and reliance are not placed on the workers, both revolution and construction will not be able to make headway on the industrial and transport front. The working class was born of and grew up in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and capitalism. It hates capitalism the most, ardently loves socialism and is most resolute in taking the socialist road. Only by relying on the working class wholeheartedly and mobilizing the workers to take part in leadership and management, discuss political affairs, grasp major issues and exercise revolutionary supervision over the enterprise leadership, can Chairman Mao’s proletarian revolutionary line be carried out and the enterprises transformed according to the ideology and image of the vanguard of the working class, and only thus will the leadership of enterprises really be in the hands of Marxists and workers and the proletarian dic...
Teng Hsiao-ping's "relative" reliance on the working class is nothing but a refurbished version of Liu Shao-chi's theory that "the masses are backward." His so-called "relative reliance" is in effect non-reliance and opposition to reliance on the working class. Didn't Teng Hsiao-ping, after resuming work, go around visiting "those who had fallen into obscurity"? Didn't he clamour for installing in office those unrepentant capitalist-roaders who were "dead determined" and who were "not afraid of being overthrown for the second time"? This shows he wanted to rely on the bourgeoisie inside the Party. Didn't Teng Hsiao-ping prostrate himself before "foreigners" and hold in reverence "foreign specialists" and "foreign equipment"? Didn't he go out of his way to preach servility to things foreign and the doctrine of trailing behind at a snail's pace? This shows he wanted to rely on the foreign bourgeoisie. Judging from the counter-revolutionary political incident at Tien An Men Square in early April, Teng Hsiao-ping's supporters are a handful of class enemies-hostile to the dictatorship of the proletariat and new bourgeois elements including hoogans, gangsters and other dregs of society, and these, too, are persons Teng Hsiao-ping wanted to rely on. That he stood on the side of the bourgeoisie and opposed reliance on the working class precisely shows he represented the interests of the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party and was the general behind-the-scenes boss of the counter-revolutionary restorationist forces. From this we can see clearly whether Teng Hsiao-ping was for building socialism or capitalism and which direction and road he wanted our industry to follow.

What Is Behind "Rectification"?

The pretext Teng Hsiao-ping used in pushing his revisionist line on the industrial and transport front was to "develop production," and one of the measures he adopted to achieve this was all-round "rectification."

He painted a gloomy picture of the situation on the industrial and transport front since the Great Cultural Revolution began, alleging that there were "many problems." In short, everything to him was in "chaos" and this called for "serious attention"; hence the need of "relentless efforts" and "courage to carry out rectification" so as to effect a "change." Teng Hsiao-ping's words and deeds tell us that by "rectification" he meant reversing the correct appraisal of the Great Cultural Revolution and working for restoration and retrogression.
During the Great Cultural Revolution, we have smashed the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, criticized the revisionist line and dealt a telling blow to capitalist things in the superstructure and in the relations of production. Didn't this throw the bourgeois and revisionists into confusion? What is wrong with such a revolution? Under the guidance of Chairman Mao's instructions on struggle-criticism-transformation, factories and enterprises have undergone remarkable changes after going through the following stages: establishing three-in-one revolutionary committees, carrying out mass criticism, purifying the class ranks, consolidating Party organizations, simplifying the administrative structure, changing irrational rules and regulations and sending office workers to the workshops. Rational rules and regulations have been constantly improved in the course of struggle. The cadres and masses have greatly raised their consciousness of class struggle and the struggle between the two lines. The workers now take part in leading and managing enterprises and cadres and technicians participate in physical labour. Narrow divisions of labour among workers have been done away with and the spirit of communist co-operation has been brought into full play. “The Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company” is being better implemented. Large numbers of new things conducive to restricting bourgeois right have emerged and grown in strength. The mass movement “In industry, learn from Taching” is developing in depth. The working class and the masses applaud these changes favourable to socialism in the superstructure and in the relations of production on the industrial front.

Teng Hsiao-ping alleged that the restrictive measures drawn up before the Great Cultural Revolution in accordance with Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line in running enterprises “were good and could still be used.” These words laid bare his motive and revealed that his so-called “necessary rules and regulations” were nothing but the same revisionist trash. Whether it was good or bad, the working class which has waged repeated struggles against it knows best. During the Cultural Revolution, the revisionist line was criticized by the masses and Teng Hsiao-ping made a “self-criticism” and admitted his mistakes. But later he trotted out this trash again. “Some Questions on Speeding Up Industrial Development,” concocted on instructions from him, was a complete acceptance of Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line, and in fact even went beyond it. His so-called “rectification” was a club to knock out the new emerging things and was just another term for the restoration of old things. What he wanted to “rectify” and to sweep away was Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, while what he wanted to carry forward was the revisionist tradition. What he wanted to “rectify” was to make a clean sweep of the established socialist relations of production and the new emerging things in the superstructure and the relations of production that restrict bourgeois right. Instead, he wanted to restore and expand capitalist and revisionist things. He wanted to “rectify” “The Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company” and restore the rules and regulations of the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Combine of the Soviet Union. Teng Hsiao-ping said that the crux of “rectification” was a “question of leading bodies,” and he wanted to set up from top to bottom “powerful, daring and capable” leading bodies, that is to say, he wanted to call to office those who dared to practise revisionism and were “experienced” and “able” in doing so, so that he could, from top to bottom, push a revisionist line, reverse correct verdicts and restore capitalism.

Another excuse Teng Hsiao-ping used to carry out his “rectification” was that the “production capacity has not been brought into full play,” as if his “rectification” was meant to develop production. This could fool no one. Experience, both positive and negative, has proved that only revolution can liberate the productive forces and promote production. To bring the production capacity in industry into fuller play, we must keep to the principle of grasping revolution, promoting production and continually resolve the contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base. Before the Cultural Revolution, Teng Hsiao-ping, in collaboration with Liu Shao-chi, pushed a revisionist line on the industrial and transport front and obdurately tried to protect and extend things in the superstructure and in the relations of production which were similar to those in the old society. As a result, they interfered with and sabotaged the implementation of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and seriously hampered the development of socialist industry in our country. During the Cultural Revolution, the working class and revolutionary people have criticized the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and hit hard at the old things in the superstructure and in the relations of production, thereby promoting the rapid development of industrial production and construction. With the deepening of the struggle against the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, the enthusiasm of the broad masses of workers, cadres and revolutionary intellectuals on the industrial and transport front for grasping revolution, promoting production has soared to a new high and industrial production is making big headway. All these are a powerful rebuttal to the reactionary fallacies spread by Teng Hsiao-ping. His bitter opposition to making changes in the relations of production and in the superstructure reveals his true motive of trying to sabotage socialist revolution and socialist production and to restore capitalism.

(Abridged translation of an article in "Hongqi," No. 5, 1976)