

**LIU SHAO-CHI**

**THE VICTORY OF  
MARXISM-LENINISM  
IN CHINA**

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING**

LIU SHAO-CHI

THE VICTORY OF MARXISM-  
LENINISM IN CHINA

*Written for the journal World Marxist Review  
(Problems of Peace and Socialism) in celebration  
of the tenth anniversary of the People's Republic of China*

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING 1959

**T**EN years have passed since the founding of the great People's Republic of China.

The Chinese revolution is the continuation of the great October Revolution. The great October Revolution opened up a new era in human history and began to change the face of the world. The success of the Soviet Union in building socialism, the victory of the anti-fascist world war in which the Soviet Union was the main force, and the founding of many socialist states in Europe and Asia, all demonstrate the irresistible historical law of the rise of socialism and the decline of capitalism. The victory of the Chinese revolution further changed the face of the world. The Chinese revolution made a very big breach on the imperialist front in the East and dealt a fatal blow to the imperialist colonial system. New China joined the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries form the big socialist family of unity and friendship which embraces one-third of the world's population and extends over a vast, compact land-mass in Europe and Asia. The Chinese revolution has a great attraction for peoples in all the backward countries that have suffered, or are suffering, from imperialist oppression. They feel that they should also be able to do what the Chinese have done. All this clearly shows that there has been a new change in the relative strengths of capitalism and socialism in the world.

The victory of the Chinese revolution has brought about the thorough liberation of China's social produc-

tive forces and has enabled China's socialist construction to advance at top speed, thus effecting rapid changes in the poverty and backwardness of China.

In the first three years following the liberation of the whole country, from 1950 to 1952, China successfully completed the task of rehabilitating the national economy and raised its industrial and agricultural production generally up to and beyond the highest levels ever achieved in old China. From 1953 to 1957 the Chinese people carried out the First Five-Year Plan, which increased the total value of industrial output by 141 per cent, of agricultural output by 25 per cent, and raised the proportion of modern industry in the national economy from 26.7 per cent in 1952 to 40 per cent in 1957. The fulfilment of the First Five-Year Plan laid the preliminary foundation of China's industrialization. In 1958 we began to implement the Second Five-Year Plan. The big leap in the national economy took place in this year. The total value of industrial output rose by 66 per cent and the total value of agricultural output increased by 25 per cent over 1957. On the basis of last year's big leap forward, this year is witnessing a continued leap forward. Compared with 1958, it is planned that this year the total value of industrial and agricultural production will increase by 20 per cent, the increase in the total value of industrial output being 25.6 per cent and that of agricultural output 10 per cent. The planned output of major industrial and agricultural products such as steel, coal, metallurgical equipment, electric power generating equipment, metal-cutting machine tools, cotton yarn, timber, grain and cotton will all fulfil, overfulfil or nearly fulfil their respective 1962 targets originally set in the Second Five-Year Plan. China's lightning

speed in developing its social productive forces cannot be matched by any capitalist country and it certainly could never be dreamed of in old China.

Marx's saying that "revolutions are the locomotives of history"<sup>1</sup> is absolutely correct. In China, without the democratic revolution that overthrew imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, without the socialist revolution that abolished the capitalist system, there could be no rapid progress of modern industry, modern agriculture and modern science and culture; no situation as the one that prevails today when the people of the whole country are working for the cause of socialism and communism vigorously and resolutely. Revolution has brought the Chinese people boundless hope and an extremely brilliant future.

The victory of the Chinese people in the past ten years is the victory of Marxism-Leninism, the victory of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the victory of the general lines of the Chinese Communist Party for democratic revolution, for socialist revolution and for socialist construction.

During the period of China's democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Tse-tung repeatedly expounded the idea that "the whole Chinese revolutionary movement led by the Chinese Communist Party is a complete revolutionary movement embracing the two revolutionary stages, democratic and socialist.... We can give correct leadership to the Chinese revolution only on the basis of a clear understanding of both the differences between the democratic and socialist revolutions and their inter-

---

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1951, Vol. I, p. 198.

connections."<sup>1</sup> On the one hand, the right opportunists in the Chinese revolution, like the Russian Mensheviks, set up a "Great Wall" between the democratic and socialist revolutions, failed to see the interconnections of the two revolutions and the possible prospect, during the democratic revolution, of transforming it into a socialist revolution. On the other hand, the "left" opportunists, like the Russian Trotskyites, confused the distinction between the democratic and socialist revolutions and would eliminate the bourgeoisie and carry out the tasks of the socialist revolution in the stage of the democratic revolution. Both of these two erroneous tendencies cost the Chinese revolution dearly. Contrary to "left" and right opportunism, the correct policy represented by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in guiding the Chinese revolution was: on the one hand, by following the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolutionary development by stages, a clear distinction was made between the revolutionary tasks of the two stages, the democratic and socialist revolutions; on the other hand, by following the Marxist-Leninist theory of uninterrupted revolution, the two revolutions were closely linked together and every means was sought during the stage of democratic revolution to create the conditions for the future realization of socialist revolution, so that the struggles of the socialist revolution could be waged without interruption immediately after the nationwide victory of the democratic revolution.

The firm grasping of the hegemony in the democratic revolution by the proletariat through the Communist Party is the key to ensuring the thorough victory of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1954, Vol. III, p. 101.

democratic revolution and the successful switch-over from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. None of the Chinese bourgeois political parties could put forward a thoroughly anti-imperialist and anti-feudal programme, could carry the Chinese democratic revolution to the end. Our Party's general line in leading the democratic revolution was to unite all the forces that could be united and thoroughly carry out the struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism under the leadership of the proletariat and on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance. This general line is summed up and defined by Comrade Mao Tse-tung as "the revolution of the masses of people, led by the proletariat, to oppose imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism."<sup>1</sup>

China was a big, backward country. Over 80 per cent of her people lived in the rural areas; 70 per cent of this rural population were poor peasants and farm labourers. The peasant question was the central question in our democratic revolution. The rule of reaction in old China was extremely barbarous. The masses of the people had no rights whatsoever. Progressive revolutionaries were subject to mass arrests and execution. In the democratic revolutionary period, the Chinese Communist Party, therefore, went deep into the villages and for 22 years led the armed revolutionary struggle which used the villages to encircle the cities. What the Party adopted was the mass line policy of resolutely relying on the peasants' political consciousness and organized strength, mobilizing the peasants to save them-

---

<sup>1</sup> From *Talk at the Conference of Cadres from Shansi and Suiyuan*.

selves, to overthrow the landlords, to acquire land and safeguard the land (this policy of the Party was carried out continuously up to the land reform after the founding of the People's Republic of China); not the contrary bourgeois policy of "bestowing" land on the peasants as a favour. This enabled the Party to build powerful and reliable revolutionary bastions in the rural areas, to build up the revolutionary army and revolutionary bases, gradually raise the revolutionary enthusiasm and revolutionary discipline of the broad masses of impoverished peasants close to the level of the revolutionary proletariat, and receive from them the continuous supply of manpower and material reserves needed by the Party and the people's army led by the Party. By depending on rural revolutionary bases the Chinese Communist Party waged the revolutionary war, and carried out land reform and economic and cultural construction in rural revolutionary bases. Essentially these were great, protracted and recurrent rehearsals in preparation for the nationwide victory. These rehearsals educated the masses, tempered the army, stored up revolutionary strength, trained the cadres and enabled the Party's leadership to acquire rich experience in all fields.

With the establishment of the closest alliance between the proletariat and the peasant masses in the democratic revolution, we were able to solve the question of forming a revolutionary united front with the national bourgeoisie in a correct way. Taking China's specific conditions into consideration, we properly distinguished between the two sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie: One was the bourgeoisie of bureaucrats and compradors who were the tools of imperialism, defenders of feudalism and its allies and the vicious enemy of the national

democratic revolution against whom resolute struggles must be waged. The other was the national bourgeoisie, who, oppressed and pushed around by imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, desired an independent development of the nation's economy and therefore it was possible for them to join the revolution or stay neutral in the revolution. But they were also weak-kneed, had the dual character of being revolutionary as well as reactionary, and often took a wavering middle-of-the-road position. This made it necessary for us, on the one hand, to unite with them under certain conditions to carry on the revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism; and on the other hand, also to struggle against their proneness to compromises. By putting such a united front policy into practice, we realized our aim of expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle-of-the-road forces and isolating the reactionary forces; solidly preserved the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution and rallied the broadest possible masses of the people.

During the period of democratic revolution in China, neither the right opportunists, who severed the connections between the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, nor the "left" opportunists, who mixed the two up, understood how great the significance of the peasant question was for our revolutionary cause; therefore, they were not able to handle the question of the bourgeoisie correctly. The right opportunists pursued a policy of capitulation towards the bourgeoisie and regarded the democratic revolution mainly as the concern of the bourgeoisie. They did not rely on the worker-peasant alliance, but mainly on the united front with the bourgeoisie, and only united with them without

waging the necessary struggles. In doing so they gave up the hegemony of the proletariat, thus causing the defeat of the revolution and serious setbacks to the cause of the proletariat and the broad masses when the bourgeoisie betrayed the revolution. Even when the conditions for the victory of the revolution were ripe and it was necessary to seize the opportunity to wage a decisive struggle, the right opportunists did not have the courage to strive for victory and even tried to prevent victory. The "left" opportunists did not feel like uniting with all sorts of petty-bourgeois masses and the national bourgeoisie; they wrongly regarded the middle-of-the-road forces as the main target of their blows and denied the necessity and possibility of uniting with, or neutralizing, the various middle-of-the-road forces in the democratic revolution. They only waged struggles against the national bourgeoisie, did not properly unite with them and still less were they willing to concentrate the fire against the main enemy by exploiting the concrete contradictions among the enemies. This, too, resulted in abandoning the hegemony of the proletariat, leaving the proletariat to carry on the struggle single-handed and rendering it impossible for the revolution to gain victory. The "left" opportunists and the right opportunists had one thing in common: both of them ignored the revolutionary urge and perseverance of the peasants and, during the reign of reaction, denied that we could hold on in the countryside, establish revolutionary bases there and finally succeed in seizing the cities by encircling them from the countryside. Under certain conditions, therefore, the "left" opportunists and right opportunists could change positions. For instance, Comrade Wang Ming was the main exponent of the third "leftist" line

during the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War in our country, but by the time of the War of Resistance to Japanese Aggression, he became the main exponent of right opportunism.

In their struggles against "left" and right opportunism, the Chinese Marxist-Leninists, headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, have united the whole Party and have thus made the Chinese revolution progress along a correct path and achieve one revolutionary victory after another.

The victory of the people's revolution led by the Chinese Communist Party thoroughly smashed the reactionary rule of the Kuomintang in old China and the bureaucratic and warlord institutions it employed to oppress the people. This led to the founding of the great People's Republic in 1949 which is essentially a dictatorship of the proletariat, and thus successfully brought about the switch-over from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. As far as the main question of the revolution is concerned, i.e., the question of state power, the founding of the People's Republic of China marked the end of the democratic revolution and the beginning of the socialist revolution in China. While leading the democratic revolution to victory, the Chinese proletariat firmly established its political control of the state; therefore, there was no longer any need to conduct another struggle for the seizure of state power to ensure the victory of socialism. The reason for this is that during the democratic revolution our Party never forgot for a moment that our final goal is to carry out the socialist revolution and throughout the protracted struggles of the democratic revolution it already paid close attention to the establishment and consolidation of the hegemony of the proletariat.

In March 1949, on the eve of the nationwide victory, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, speaking at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, pointed out that after the nationwide victory of the Chinese revolution, the main external contradiction would still be the contradiction between the Chinese people and imperialism, while at home, the main contradiction between the Chinese people, on the one hand, and the landlord class and bureaucrat-capitalists, on the other, would give way to the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie, that is, the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. He also set forth a series of fundamental policies for the resolution of this contradiction. In the early years following the nationwide victory, although it was still necessary for the Chinese people to continue to carry out the tasks left over from the period of the democratic revolution, mainly the task of implementing land reform over a large part of the country to eliminate the feudal landlord class, the transition to socialism had actually begun in 1949. With the support of the broad masses of the people and the power of the state, the Chinese proletariat confiscated bureaucrat-capital, kept a firm hold on the essential economic mainsprings of the state, energetically established a powerful socialist state economy and secured its leading position in the entire national economy.

Towards the end of 1952, when the tasks of restoring the national economy and clearing away the survivals of feudalism had been in the main fulfilled, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung put forward the general line for the period of transition, that is, the general line of simultaneous development of socialist revolution and socialist

construction, and set forth the task of realizing the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicraft industry, and capitalist industry and commerce step by step, throughout the country, and the task of realizing the socialist industrialization of the country step by step. This general line was put forward at the time when the Chinese people were in the thick of the great war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea. We resolutely fought the U.S. imperialists who tried to strangle New China, rallied the entire nation and won great victories in the struggle. At the same time, on the home front, we carried on socialist transformation and construction without interruption.

This general line of the Chinese Communist Party was a line to lead Chinese society in its transition from the complicated economic structure of that time, which embraced not only socialist economy but also capitalist and individual economies, to a homogeneous socialist economic structure. At that time some people denied the necessity of the transition to socialism. They either attempted to develop capitalism in China and follow the old capitalist road, or tried to halt the revolution and preserve for a long time to come the status quo—with the socialist economy and capitalist economy existing side by side. The Marxist-Leninist general line of the Party affirmed the necessity of the transition from capitalism to socialism and thus rejected the various erroneous rightist viewpoints. At the same time, this Marxist-Leninist general line of the Party also affirmed that the transition to socialism must be gradual and that the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce must also be gradual and thus rejected the erroneous



"leftist" viewpoint which hoped to make a clean sweep of capitalism overnight.

In effecting the socialist transformation of agriculture, of capitalist industry and commerce, we took a series of steps characteristic of our national peculiarities, in the light of the specific conditions in our country.

Three successive steps were taken in the socialist transformation of our agriculture. Step one: the land reform was immediately followed by the extensive development of mutual-aid organizations for collective labour on the basis of the individual economy. These mutual-aid organizations which were in the nature of embryonic socialism had already emerged in the revolutionary bases at an earlier period. Step two: this was again immediately followed by the development, on the basis of the mutual-aid movement, of agricultural producers' co-operatives with their special features of pooling the land as shares and unified management. These co-operatives were semi-socialist in nature, since the land and the principal means of production were still privately owned. We called them agricultural producers' co-operatives of the elementary type. Step three: the collectivization of the land and the principal means of production and the establishment of agricultural producers' co-operatives entirely socialist in nature, which were known as agricultural producers' co-operatives of the advanced type.

There were at one time controversies between different viewpoints within our Party on the question of agricultural co-operation.

One viewpoint was that the level of our industrialization was still very low and that we were not yet in a position to effect the mechanization of agriculture, so it was impossible and improper to introduce agricultural

co-operation too soon. The facts, however, have exploded this viewpoint. We carried out the task of agricultural co-operation in the virtual absence of mechanization.

Another viewpoint was that the rapid realization of co-operation would inevitably lower agricultural production. The facts have exploded this viewpoint too. In the course of agricultural co-operation and afterwards, China's agricultural production continued to rise, and at considerable speed at that, rather than decline.

Still another viewpoint was that the realization of agricultural co-operation at such high speed would impair the unity of the peasants, or, in other words, that in addition to the rich peasants, the well-to-do middle peasants would also feel dissatisfied with us or even oppose us while only those peasants who were relatively worse off would support us. The facts have exploded this viewpoint too. Thanks to our policy of uniting with the well-to-do middle peasants and the policy of paying compensation in annual instalments to the well-to-do middle peasants who joined the co-operatives with their large farm implements and draught animals, and thanks to the rise in the production of the co-operatives year by year, the overwhelming majority of the well-to-do middle peasants were satisfied in the main with agricultural co-operation.

In short, the facts have shown that our method of "striking the iron while it is hot," setting up without delay typical examples for the rest to follow and popularizing them step by step to carry out agricultural co-operation immediately after the land reform, is a good Marxist-Leninist policy. If we had kept the revolution at a standstill after the land reform, let the spontaneous forces of capitalism in the countryside grow, and allowed

the polarization of the peasantry into two extremes, we would have faced fairly strong resistance and met with much greater difficulties in carrying out agricultural co-operation at a later date.

How did we realize the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce? We did this mainly by carrying out the policy of utilizing, restricting and transforming capitalist industry and commerce, and through various forms of state capitalism, achieving the aim of socialist nationalization. Generally speaking, the initial form of state capitalism was to supply private capitalist industries with raw materials, to place orders with them for processing and manufacturing goods and let the state enterprises exclusively purchase and market their goods. As to private capitalist commercial enterprises, they were allowed to serve as retail distributors or commission agents for the state. The higher form of state capitalism was to place private capitalist enterprises under joint state-private management—beginning with the conversion of individual concerns into joint state-private enterprises and going on to the placing of capitalist enterprises under joint state-private management by whole trades, paying the capitalists a fixed rate of interest for a definite number of years.

There were also some controversies between different viewpoints within our Party on the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce.

One view held that capitalist industry and commerce should only be utilized but should not be restricted and transformed, or that we had placed too many restrictions and had carried out the transformation too hastily. This was in effect an attempt to preserve the capitalist system for a long period of time. It is impossible for the

capitalist system of exploitation and the socialist system of public ownership to live side by side for long in one and the same society—one must defeat the other.

Another view contended that we had “compromised too much” since we not only had carried out the transformation of capitalist industry and commerce in a step-by-step process, but had also practised redemption, given the bourgeoisie the right to vote and given a definite political status to the representatives of the bourgeoisie. They held that it was impermissible in principle to continue to maintain a united front with the national bourgeoisie after the victory of the Chinese revolution. They asked that we apply the same policy towards the national bourgeoisie as we did towards the landlord class and the bureaucrat-capitalist class, i.e., to confiscate the property of the national bourgeoisie or to adopt simple policies which would quickly squeeze capitalist industry and commerce out of the national economy, and to deprive the capitalists of the right to vote. These people forgot that it is advantageous to the proletariat to adopt the policy of redemption in certain concrete historical conditions. Marx and Lenin had expressed this view many times. Regarding the question that the dictatorship of the proletariat does not necessarily have to deprive the bourgeoisie of the right to vote, Lenin, too, referred to it in *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*. He said: “The question of restricting the franchise is a nationally specific and not a general question of the dictatorship.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 64.

Have we adopted a policy of "class collaboration" in handling the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie? Certainly not. Such doubts represent a misunderstanding or distortion resulting from complete ignorance of Marxism-Leninism. As a matter of fact, the policy of uniting with the national bourgeoisie and struggling with it, which we adopted to resolve this contradiction, is a very firm proletarian class policy which has nothing in common with the policy of "class collaboration." The success of our socialist transformation proves this fully.

In short, our policy of socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce has enabled us to reduce the opposition to the transformation, and in the course of the gradual transformation, to use capitalism conditionally to serve socialism, so as to facilitate the progress of socialist construction. As a result, we have been able to eliminate capitalism completely in the ownership of the means of production, and we shall transform the bourgeois elements gradually into working people earning their own living. Of course, this too is good Marxist-Leninist policy which fully suits Chinese conditions.

The method of gradual transition which we adopted in the socialist transformation of agriculture and of capitalist industry and commerce did not prolong the time of transformation, as some people alleged. On the contrary, the transformation was carried out very rapidly. By the second half of 1955 we had already set up agricultural co-operatives of the advanced type throughout the countryside, and immediately afterwards, in 1956, we converted capitalist industrial and commercial concerns into joint state-private enterprises by whole trades, and at the same time organized the handicraftsmen into

co-operatives. This means that in less than seven years after the founding of the People's Republic of China we accomplished in the main the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce, and basically solved the question of "who will win" in the ownership of the means of production. In the course of fulfilling this task, practically no destruction was involved and industrial and agricultural production rose steadily.

Has the socialist revolution in China come to an end with the completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production? Some people think it has, and that there is no need to carry on any revolution whatsoever. We think this viewpoint is wrong. The socialist revolution has not yet ended, it must go on and it must be carried on to the end. Today the capitalists in our country are still receiving a fixed rate of interest. Economically the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as two classes has not been entirely eliminated. Even if the bourgeoisie as a class has disappeared economically, the bourgeois world outlook, the political influences of the bourgeoisie and the force of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois habits will continue to exist for a long time in conflict with the socialist system. The bourgeois rightists, particularly, will take advantage of all this and launch attacks against socialism whenever they have the opportunity and plot for the restoration of capitalism. At times their attacks can still be extremely frantic. That is why we cannot limit the socialist revolution to the economic front; it must be carried out on the political and ideological fronts as well. In his *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among*

the People Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed this out clearly. He said:

The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between various political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will still be long and devious and at times may even become very acute. The proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, so does the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the question whether socialism or capitalism will win is still not really settled. Marxists are still a minority of the entire population as well as of the intellectuals. Marxism therefore must still develop through struggle.<sup>1</sup>

The political and ideological struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is unavoidable throughout the period of transition. But such struggles are like waves, with ups and downs. Sometimes they become acute and at other times they are mild. Such struggles will disappear only when the bourgeois political and ideological influences are finally wiped out.

To carry on the socialist revolution to the end, Comrade Mao Tse-tung suggested that we should distinguish between two types of contradictions of different natures—contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people—and that we should employ different methods in approaching and dealing with these two types of contradictions. He also put forward the policy of “letting a hundred flowers blossom and a

---

<sup>1</sup> Mao Tse-tung: *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1959, pp. 50-51.

hundred schools of thought contend.” In 1957 our Party launched the rectification campaign in the whole Party and among the whole people to readjust the relations among the people and waged a struggle against the frantic attack of the bourgeois rightists. The result was that the enthusiasm and initiative of the masses of the people to build socialism was greatly sparked and the reactionary influences of the exploiting classes in the political and ideological fields were dealt a heavy blow and greatly weakened. On this basis our Party put forward the policy of “politics in command,” strengthened the leadership of the Party in economic and other work, and adjusted the relations between the central and the local governments, between the leaders and the led, as well as relations in other fields. At the same time the Party presented to the whole nation the slogan of “toppling superstitions, emancipating the mind, promoting the communist style of thinking, speaking and acting boldly,” encouraged experiments of a revolutionary character and mass innovations and creation of a mass character, and guided the people to revise and abolish those rules and regulations that are no longer suitable. In order to carry out the revolution in education, the Party put forward the policy of education in the service of proletarian politics and the integration of education with productive labour. As a result of all these revolutionary measures, “a vigorous and lively political situation in which there are both centralism and democracy, both discipline and freedom, and both unity of will and personal ease of mind,” as Comrade Mao Tse-tung described it, has been developing ever more extensively in our country. In the spring of 1958 our Party put forward the timely general line of “going all out, aiming high and achieving

greater, faster, better and more economical results to build socialism.”

Inspired by the Party's general line for socialist construction, the people throughout the country were high in spirit and strong in morale so that a big leap forward was effected in the national economy and people's communes were established throughout the countryside in 1958. Unprecedented achievements were also made in the development of science, technology, culture and education. This is the result of carrying the socialist revolution to the end and correctly handling contradictions among the people and thereby releasing the social productive forces thoroughly.

There have been controversies between different views within our Party on the questions of distinguishing between the two types of contradictions, the big leap forward and the people's communes. Under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, our Party has resolutely upheld the correct line, repudiated various erroneous views within the Party and has therefore been able to unite the entire Party and people throughout the country and continuously win new victories in the cause of socialism.

Some people say that while it is understandable that contradictions exist between ourselves and the enemy in the period of transition, it is hard to understand that contradictions among the people should exist under socialism. They hold that there is no need to draw a line between the two types of contradictions—the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and the contradictions among the people. This view is wrong. Drawing a clear-cut line between the two types of contradictions is of great theoretical and practical significance for the correct carrying out of the class struggle under

the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the correct handling of the various contradictions among the labouring people that do not fall into the category of the class struggle.

In present-day China, there exist not only contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, but also a large number of contradictions among the labouring people. For example, the contradictions arising from the differences between the working class and the peasantry and between mental and manual labour, from the remnant habits and ideological influences of the exploiting classes among the labouring people, etc. As to the contradictions between the social productive forces and the relations of production, the contradictions between the economic base and the superstructure, and the contradictions that arise from the differences between the correct and erroneous views of the people and between the advanced and the backward, they have always existed. They exist now and they will exist for ever. It is only that in socialist society, the character of these contradictions and the method of resolving them differ fundamentally from those in class society. The view that under the socialist system, or when mankind enters classless communist society, there will no longer be any contradictions among the people runs counter to Marxism-Leninism and is entirely wrong.

All types of contradictions that exist in society will inevitably find expression in the political and economic life of our country and in our inner Party life. Therefore, we must learn to recognize and handle these contradictions correctly. Only thus can we thoroughly eliminate the hostile anti-socialist forces, complete the transformation of members of the bourgeoisie and the

upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie and their intellectuals, adjust the relations among the people, and carry our cause forward successfully. In socialist society and communist society, the unity and struggle of contradictions and the resolution of contradictions are still the driving force of social progress.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, neglecting to make a clear distinction between these two types of contradictions of different natures will give rise to the following wrong tendencies: Failing to see contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, or taking these to be contradictions among the people, not knowing that in handling such contradictions the method of dictatorship, i.e., the method of isolating, splitting up, punishing and suppression, should be used, and, instead of this, using the method of handling contradictions among the people to handle contradictions between ourselves and the enemy—this will inevitably make people commit mistakes. On the other hand, failing to see contradictions among the people, exaggerating contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and taking contradictions among the people to be contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, not knowing that in handling contradictions among the people the democratic method, i.e., the method of “starting from a desire for unity and resolving contradictions through criticism or struggle, so as to achieve a new unity on a new basis,” should be used and, instead of this, using the method of handling contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, i.e., the high-handed method, and not the method of persuasion, to handle contradictions among the people—this will also inevitably make people commit mistakes. Besides, each of the two types of contradictions can turn into the other

under certain conditions. If they do become so transformed, but our methods of handling them do not change correspondingly, we will also unavoidably commit mistakes. There are quite a few instances of our comrades committing mistakes on this question, and therefore it is vitally necessary to acquire a serious understanding of this question.

Some people say that our adoption of the policy of “letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend” is tantamount to the adoption of the policy of bourgeois “liberalism,” or the policy of so-called “liberalization.” There are also some people who worry lest our implementation of such a policy should help the anti-socialist poisonous weeds grow and result in bourgeois ideas running riot. All these people are thinking in a wrong way.

We have pursued this policy because we have full confidence in the Party’s leadership, in the great majority of the mass of the people, in the superiority of the socialist system and in the truth of Marxism. To adopt this policy is by no means to implement the bourgeois policy of “liberalization,” but to pursue an extremely firm class policy of the proletariat. Our purpose in adopting this policy is to promote the development and flourishing of science, art and culture and the development of Marxism and socialist ideology guided by Marxism. The purpose of carrying out this policy at a time when bourgeois ideological influences still exist in society is to help the proletariat defeat the bourgeoisie politically and ideologically, to eliminate its influence, and not to permit bourgeois ideology to run riot. This policy also applies to the correct handling of contradictions among the people in the political sphere. In a socialist society, Marxist ideology

still has to develop in the struggle with all kinds of non-Marxist ideologies; socialist ideology still has to extend its own hold in the struggle with all kinds of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies. As to the various views held among the people, we must allow them to be fully expressed and they must be fully debated by using the methods of criticism and reasoning. Only in this way can correct views be advanced, erroneous views overcome and the issues truly settled.

It is true that the bourgeoisie will make use of this policy of "letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend" to engage in anti-socialist activities. However, under present conditions in China, the proletariat has the upper hand in every aspect. We have nothing to fear from the bourgeoisie using this slogan to wage their struggle against the proletariat. We have never recognized anti-socialist utterances and acts of the bourgeoisie as being legal under the proletarian dictatorship. We have always openly declared that in our garden, the hundred flowers of socialism should be in full bloom and that the anti-socialist poisonous weeds should be weeded out. The question is: what means should we use to weed out the anti-socialist poisonous weeds effectively? In a socialist society, so long as the political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie has not been wiped out, anti-socialist bourgeois poisonous weeds will exist objectively and will often appear in the guise of fragrant flowers of socialism. When people lack experience in struggling against poisonous weeds, they are often not so good at distinguishing them from fragrant flowers. It is even possible that they greet a disguised anti-socialist poisonous weed as a fragrant flower of socialism. In certain branches of our cultural work, some comrades at

one time only allowed what they considered to be fragrant flowers to grow for fear that poisonous weeds might appear. As a result, many fragrant flowers beneficial to socialism were mistaken for poisonous weeds and their growth was thwarted. On the other hand, many harmful poisonous weeds were able to grow surreptitiously in disguise. The ideas of these comrades were wrong and childish. As a matter of fact, it is those anti-socialist poisonous weeds which are hidden or appear in disguise that are the more harmful to the proletarian dictatorship. It is not a bad thing to let poisonous weeds come out in their true colours. On the contrary, it is a very good thing. For only by so doing can the mass of people be trained to discern a poisonous weed and develop their ability to fight against poisonous weeds and thus the aim of letting a hundred flowers of socialism blossom and weeding out the anti-socialist poisonous weeds can be achieved. This was the method that we used to fight the bourgeois rightists in 1957 and, by relying on the mass of the people, repulse the ferocious attacks of the rightists.

The facts have shown that the policy of "letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend" has indeed strengthened the leadership of Marxism in the realm of ideology and has not in the least weakened that position of leadership. It has enhanced the ability of the mass of people to struggle against reactionary ideologies and not weakened that ability in the slightest. Under existing conditions in China, this policy benefits the proletariat and operates to the disadvantage of the bourgeoisie, which is opposed to socialism.

In 1958, the Chinese people created a situation in which the national economy made a big leap forward. The

facts of this big leap forward are undeniable. However, certain people assert that our country's big leap forward in 1958 is an abnormal phenomenon, that organizing mass movements in economic construction can only cause dislocation in production and that even though a temporary leap forward may be effected it will inevitably result in such disproportions in the national economy that it will be impossible to keep the leap forward going. This point of view is entirely wrong.

In carrying on economic construction, is it a good thing or not to organize mass movements? Our socialist construction is based on the conscious effort of millions of people. It would be impossible to have vigorous socialist construction without bringing into full play the creative energy of the masses. Our country's 650 million people who are liberated, united and organized are a truly great creative force. In the mass campaign to make iron and steel last year, tens of millions of people neglected their sleep and meals and paid no attention to material remuneration. They were in the highest of spirits and showed boundless enthusiasm and communist daring in building a new life. The net result of all this is that a rational distribution of the iron and steel industry throughout the country has been brought about gradually and its development accelerated. In the same way, it was through large-scale mass movements and by bringing mass initiative into full play that we built the myriads of small and medium-sized water conservancy projects and the hundreds of thousands of small and medium-sized enterprises which now dot the entire country. By mobilizing the masses and pressing ahead with socialist emulation campaigns—under the slogan of “emulating the advanced, overtaking the advanced, and learning from the

advanced!”—many large enterprises have been able to bring about a rapid rise in production capacity and labour productivity and many construction projects were able to greatly economize on investments and were completed ahead of schedule. The facts prove that by mobilizing the masses to work on the front of socialist construction, we can make our national economy grow by leaps and bounds.

It is by no means fortuitous that these mass movements have come about. To bring about a speedy change in China's poverty and backwardness is the strong urge of the 650 million people of our country. Since they have become liberated under the socialist system, this urge is transformed inevitably into action and becomes a powerful and irresistible material force. With correct leadership, such mass movements can certainly become the most dynamic and constant factor facilitating the economic leap forward of our country. Our mass movements are launched under the centralized guidance of the Party. Party guidance means integrating political work with economic work, integrating the political education of the masses with material incentives and placing politics in command, making it the driving force. Hence it becomes possible under the Party's guidance to organize the mass movements for socialist construction and keep them going, bringing the initiative of the people into fullest play in the work of construction. Our national economy will continue to leap forward without pause as long as we lead the masses always to go all out and aim high and rely on the workers, peasants and technicians to carry out the technical and cultural revolutions so as to continuously introduce more modern implements and expand the application of



modern techniques in production. There can be no doubt about this.

When a mass movement is in full swing, some production regimes will be upset. But the mass movement upsets only those outdated regimes which hinder the expansion of production; at the same time it establishes new regimes which stimulate production. In 1958 we introduced through mass movements many readjustments in human relations in our enterprises. We introduced the system of workers participating in management and cadres participating in productive labour, and also the system of closely integrating under the leadership of the Party committees the work of the leading cadres, the workers and the technical and management personnel. Under proper guidance rules and regulations which had outlived their usefulness were changed. All this helped greatly to raise the level of management and production in our enterprises. The socialist system is not something petrified and fixed for all time. By changing the old order of things and introducing new ones under guidance, the advantages of the socialist system are developed and brought into full play. But to do this, we must rely on the masses; we must struggle against the force of habits which hinders the growth of the productive forces; and we must make continuous readjustments in the relations of production and the superstructure so that they can fit in with the needs of the growing social productive forces. So long as we do this, we shall be able to spur the swift advance of technical reforms and the technical revolution, stimulate the speedy growth of the social productive forces of our country and maintain a continued leap forward in the national economy.

Lenin once said:

It is important to realize how infinitely mendacious is the ordinary bourgeois conception of socialism as something lifeless, petrified, fixed once for all, whereas in reality only under socialism will a rapid, genuine, really mass forward movement, embracing first the majority and then the whole of the population, commence in all spheres of public and personal life.<sup>1</sup>

In the big leap forward which started in 1958, we are actually witnessing the emergence of such a mass forward movement in our country. Those who are critical of the mass movement stand aloof from it. They find fault with it, dampen the enthusiasm of the masses and spread feelings of despondency, dissatisfaction and pessimism. Their attitude towards the mass movement has nothing in common with the highly enthusiastic attitude which one expects of a Communist. Theirs is the lordly attitude of the bourgeoisie.

Some people assert that the adoption of a leap forward rate of advance goes against objective economic laws and will give rise to disproportions in the various branches of the national economy. But the facts controvert these assertions. Our leap forward is a new thing appearing in our country that fits in exactly with socialist economic laws. Objective economic laws cannot be violated; they must be observed. If those laws are violated it is impossible for the national economy to develop by leaps and bounds. The general line laid down by our Party comprises the whole set of policies known as "simultaneous development." They are: the simultaneous development of industry and agriculture and the

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 303.

simultaneous development of heavy and light industries, while giving priority to heavy industry; the simultaneous development of national and local industries and of large, medium-sized and small enterprises and the simultaneous employment of modern and indigenous methods of production under centralized leadership, with over-all planning, proper division of labour and co-ordination. This set of policies later on received the popular name of "walking on two legs." The adoption of such policies will avoid various types of one-sidedness in the leap forward of the national economy, such as emphasizing the importance of industry to the neglect of agriculture, emphasizing the importance of heavy industry to the neglect of light industry, emphasizing the importance of large enterprises to the neglect of medium-sized and small ones, emphasizing the importance of unified management of industries by the central authorities to the neglect of the initiative of local authorities in the development of industry, and emphasizing the importance of modern methods of production to the neglect of indigenous methods of production, and so on. That is to say, while developing the national economy at high speed, the general line of our Party calls for a unity of objective possibility and subjective activity, due attention to the various kinds of proportions and observance of objective economic laws. Since the big leap forward last year, harmonious and suitable proportions, in general, exist between the various branches of the national economy, between industry and agriculture, between heavy and light industries, and between consumption and accumulation. Although certain isolated, partial and temporary disproportions occurred, they were quickly discovered and overcome. Such isolated, partial and

temporary disproportions will crop up from time to time, and if they do, they are easy to overcome. Correct implementation of the general line of the Party and the policies of "simultaneous development" is a guarantee against the occurrence of long-term, over-all disproportions.

It goes without saying that we must do a good job of economic planning to enable, as far as possible, the various branches of the national economy to spurt ahead in harmony. We want both high speed and over-all balance. This is not easy to achieve; in high-speed development it is more likely that certain imbalances will occur. We should not, however, give way to "fear of the wolf in front and the tiger behind," vainly hoping for a haven of peace by adopting the method of reducing speed unjustifiably to achieve a balance. So long as we pay attention to summing up our experience and seriously study objective economic laws, balance can and should be achieved while developing our economy at high speed.

The speed of development of the national economy cannot possibly be the same every year. It may be higher in one year and lower in another. This is a normal state of affairs. But it can be stated positively that our economy will continue to grow year by year and that we can maintain the speed of the leap forward in its development.

Those who find fault with our big leap forward and the mass movement also find fault with our rural people's communes. They maintain that the people's communes were set up "much too soon," are "in a mess" and "outstep the level of social development and the level of the people's political consciousness." There is no valid ground at all for such charges.

It is wrong to regard the growth of the people's communes as lacking objective necessity. Those who do so fail to see that the people's communes are a new form of social organization which has grown up on the basis of the advanced agricultural producers' co-operatives. This form of social organization was created by the hundreds of millions of Chinese peasants to meet the needs of growing productive forces. It is the product of the big growth of agricultural production, which took place during the big leap forward of 1958 along with the great extension of water conservancy work, the peasants' enthusiasm in running industries and the great upsurge of socialist consciousness among the peasants. The mass of Chinese peasants have seen that the building of water conservancy works and industries, the comprehensive development of a diversified rural economy and the practice of co-ordination in the work of building various kinds of fairly large productive projects must necessarily exceed the scope of the original agricultural producers' co-operatives and require that certain kinds of new relations of production and new forms of organization should be established on the basis of developing the original agricultural producers' co-operatives. This is the people's commune. A people's commune has at its disposal the manpower of several thousand and even around ten thousand households and several tens of thousands or even over a hundred thousand *mou* of land, is able to deploy manpower and utilize natural resources more rationally for the development of the rural economy and facilitate the gradual mechanization and electrification of agriculture. The educational and cultural services and collective welfare establishments urgently needed by the peasant masses can also be extensively developed in the

people's communes. A great economy in labour has been achieved as a result of the setting up of such collective welfare establishments as community dining-rooms and kindergartens. In particular a very great number of women are freed from household chores. Only one year has passed since the rural people's communes were established, but they have fully demonstrated in practice their immense vitality. That is why the people's commune movement is a great mass movement that meets the need of the Chinese peasants to develop the rural economy rapidly and transform the poverty-stricken and backward face of the Chinese countryside, a mass movement which conforms to the laws of historical development under the conditions obtaining in China. Such a mass movement is not something that can emerge because somebody shouts for it, nor will it collapse because somebody opposes it.

Some people hold that because the people's communes as they now stand still have socialist collective ownership, there is not much difference between them and the agricultural producers' co-operatives and therefore there is no need to establish them. Such people fail to see that a new content is added on the basis of the original advanced agricultural producers' co-operatives and so a vast difference exists between the two. Within the people's commune, industry, agriculture, trade, education and military affairs are integrated (agriculture comprises farming, forestry, livestock raising, rural side lines and fishery); it organizes production as well as the livelihood of its members, and the basic unit of state power in the countryside is merged with the people's commune administration—all these things were absent in the advanced agricultural producers' co-operative. Of par-

ticular importance is the fact that although ownership in the people's commune is still socialist collective ownership and although the collective ownership of the production brigade which corresponds to the original advanced agricultural producers' co-operative is the basic form of ownership while only part of the ownership is vested in the commune as a whole, this part of the ownership now vested in the people's commune did not exist in the advanced agricultural producers' co-operative and this already contains certain elements of ownership by the whole people. As the commune is able every year to draw suitable sums for its accumulation fund from the income of the production brigades, to be put to the use of commune-run enterprises, and as the commune-run enterprises are developed and the state extends help to the commune, that part of the ownership vested in the commune will be gradually enlarged, until it becomes the basic form of ownership, while the production brigades only retain a part of the ownership. Although at present only part of the ownership is vested in the people's commune as a whole, it is this part of the ownership which holds its greatest hopes and prospects. When that part of the ownership now vested in the people's commune as a whole becomes the basic form of ownership, a reliable foundation will have been laid for the transition from socialist collective ownership to socialist ownership by the whole people in the countryside. As to the distribution system in the people's communes, at the present time they implement, in the main, a wage system based on the principle "to each according to his work" and at the same time they adopt a supply system which to some extent embodies the rudiments of the principle of "to each according to his needs." This also

did not exist in the original agricultural producers' co-operatives. Many people's communes have put into effect a supply system which provides members with a suitable amount of free supplies. (Generally speaking, these free allocations constitute 20 to 30 per cent of the total incomes of the members.) At present its main purpose is to ensure that provision is made for the livelihood of those who are not able-bodied and of the children. This is a very good method of implementing social insurance in our rural areas and of helping families which have more children or have other heavy burdens. It meets the present actual needs of life of the peasant masses. Of course, this does not yet signify implementation of the communist principle "to each according to his needs."

Some people are of the opinion that people's communes can only be communist in nature and must fully adopt the principle "to each according to his needs," otherwise, they cannot be called people's communes. They therefore regard the setting up of people's communes under present conditions as merely a utopian measure divorced from reality. They give a completely mechanical interpretation to the nature of the people's communes. They do not understand that our present people's communes in the rural areas are a form of basic social organization, possessing all the above-mentioned special features; that this form of social organization, therefore, has very great flexibility and is capable of accommodating productive forces at different levels in both socialist and communist society and their corresponding levels of relations of production. As far as our country is concerned, this form of social organization suits not only the socialist collective ownership of the present but future socialist ownership by the whole peo-

ple as well, not only the present socialist system of giving to each according to his work but the future communist system of giving to each according to his needs. There is every reason to believe that this form of social organization, the people's commune, will also be a suitable form of social organization at the primary level after our country has entered communism. The commune system, as Comrade Mao Tse-tung points out, embodies a process of development. In our countryside, this social organization, the people's commune, can rapidly advance rural economic development while social economic growth will, in its turn, promote the development of the people's commune system both in content and form. With the birth of this social organization, the people's commune, we have in practice discovered the road that, under the prevailing conditions in our country, will lead to the gradual transition from socialist collective ownership to socialist ownership by the whole people, and to the future gradual transition from socialism to communism in the countryside. It is wrong to think that all expectations for the commune can be realized once the people's commune is established. It will be a complete mistake to think that because the people's communes need a process of gradual development, they were set up too early, that it would have been better not to set them up and that those already set up should be dissolved.

To find fault with our big leap and people's communes means to find fault with our Party's general line for building socialism. Who are these people finding fault with the Party's general line? In our own ranks, they are the right opportunists. They represent bourgeois ideology within our Party. When hostile forces at home and abroad were viciously attacking us, they even denied

the great achievements in our work and described our great cause as being in an awful mess, using as their pretext certain shortcomings in our work, which had long ago been discovered and corrected by the Party's Central Committee. They tried to prevent our cause from advancing, to prevent the continued leap forward this year and prevent the thorough implementation of the Party's general line. The Eighth Plenary Session of the Party's Eighth Central Committee pointed out that right opportunism is the principal danger in our country today. To wage a struggle against right opportunism, overcome right opportunism and wipe out its influences is a major task of our Party at the present time.

The general line of our Party is correct and our achievements are great. Now we are successfully waging the struggle against right opportunism. In response to the call of the Eighth Plenary Session of the Party's Eighth Central Committee, the broad masses of the people are working for a big new upsurge to increase production and practise economy; this is a powerful rejoinder to the attacks launched by hostile forces at home and abroad, at the same time it is also a reply to the attacks by right opportunists.

Our great cause is advancing successfully. Our Party shares the destiny and life-breath of the Chinese people; our cause, we have always believed, is a component part of the socialist cause of all the world. In our country's revolution and construction, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have given us very great help while the working people of the whole world and the progressive forces of all lands have also given us a very great measure of sympathy and support. With the Soviet Union and other socialist countries our country has

established a friendship and unity which is indestructible and is growing daily. Our slogans are: "Long live the great unity of the Chinese people!" "Long live the great unity of the peoples of all lands!" Supported by these two great unities, our cause is invincible.

All our victories are fresh confirmations of, and fresh victories for, Marxism-Leninism. There was once some talk about Marxism only being applicable to well-developed capitalist countries but not to economically backward countries; only to the West, not to the East. After the victory of the Russian October Revolution and the Chinese revolution, there has been another kind of talk about Marxism only being applicable to the Eastern and not to the Western countries. All such ideas are myths spread by the bourgeois reactionaries and their henchmen. In actual fact, since the emergence of Marxism, whether in economically advanced countries or in economically backward countries, whether in the West or the East, every historical event and every revolutionary experience has proved repeatedly the correctness of Marxism. The struggles and revolutions of the masses in the various countries take place and progress in different historical environments and under different historical conditions, but, no matter how complex and tortuous are the revolutions in the various countries, it is no more possible for the development of any country to depart from the common historical course pointed out by Marxism than it is for the earth to leave its orbit revolving round the sun.

The Chinese Communist Party, which has led the Chinese revolution to victory, is armed with Marxism-Leninism; this is epitomized in the famous words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung: "The integration of the universal

truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution." Under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist Party has made consistent efforts to enable itself to solve the various problems of the Chinese revolution and construction by flexibly applying the general principles of Marxism-Leninism in the light of the concrete conditions in China. The fact that Marxism-Leninism has been widely disseminated in such a large Eastern country as ours with a population of 650 million and that it has resulted in victory in the actual practice of the revolution and construction must, by all accounts, be considered a big event in the history of the development of Marxism-Leninism. Of course, revolution and construction in China have features peculiar to this country. But it is also possible that some of these important special features may reappear in some other countries. In this sense, Chinese experience is to a certain extent of international significance.

Let us raise high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and march forward!

Long live the victory of Marxism-Leninism throughout the world!

September 14, 1959

刘 少 奇

馬克思列宁主义在中国的胜利

\*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1959年12月第一版

編号：（英）3050-244

Y 0 3 3

