

We should not establish inter-unit ties; we should not organize fighting groups or gang up in factions. We should have faith in the masses and rely on them. We should carry out education and do the ideological work well among the few people who are misled and duped by rumours.

Let us unite and advance along the course indicated by Chairman Mao!

RED FLAG ATTACKS CAPITALIST RESTORATION PROGRAM

Peking Domestic Service in Mandarin 2230 GMT 4 Apr 76 OW

[Text of article by Cheng Yueh published in RED FLAG No 4 and reprinted in the 5 April PEOPLE'S DAILY: "A General Program for Capitalist Restoration--an Analysis of 'On the General Program for All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Country'"]

The great struggle against the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in surging ahead from victory to victory. The revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" set forth by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party has been penetratingly criticized by Chairman Mao and the whole party, the whole army and the people of the whole country. Chairman Mao pointed out: "What 'taking the three directives as the key link!' Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." Chairman Mao's instruction fundamentally and explicitly points out the reactionary essence of "taking the three directives as the key" in negating class struggle as the key link and the party's basic line, in opposing the dictatorship of the proletariat and in restoring capitalism.

A small number of people once held that "taking the three directives as the key link" only involved the question of formulation. Well, then, let us take a look at an article written with the instigation of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party. The article, entitled "On the General Program for All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Country," will be called "The General Program" for short.

In ever blunter words, the article has thoroughly exposed the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished out by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party as a program for all-round capitalist restoration.

1. "The General Program" begins by setting the realization of the "four modernizations" as the objective of the party's struggle in the coming 25 years and then puts forward "taking the three directives as the key link." The article says: "The three directives are not only the general program for all work of the whole party, the whole army and the whole country at present, but also the general work program for fulfilling the grand objectives in the entire course of struggle in the coming 25 years." This generalization pointedly shows that the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished out by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party is entirely aimed at countering Chairman Mao's instructions on taking class struggle as the key link and at negating our party's basic program and line.

What is the fundamental mission of the whole party and the people of the whole country in the entire historical period of socialism, including the coming 25 years? In its first chapter entitled "General Program," our party's constitution definitely stipulates:

"The basic program of the Communist Party of China is the complete overthrow of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in place of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and the triumph of socialism over capitalism, the ultimate aim of the party is the realization of communism."

To fulfill our party's basic program, Chairman Mao has set forth the party's basic line for the entire historical period of socialism, that is: "Socialist society covers a fairly long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. We must recognize the protracted and complex nature of this struggle. We must raise our vigilance. We must conduct socialist education. We must correctly understand and handle class contradictions and class struggle, distinguish the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy from those among the people and handle them correctly. Otherwise, a socialist country like ours will turn into its opposite and degenerate, and a capitalist restoration will take place. From now on we must remind ourselves of this every year, every month and every day so that we can retain a rather sober understanding of this problem and have a Marxist-Leninist line."

Therefore, the basic mission for the whole party and the people of the whole country at present as well as throughout the historical period of socialism, including the coming 25 years, cannot be anything else except striving to carry out our party's basic program and line.

Should we develop the national economy? Should we achieve an all-round modernization of agriculture, industry, national defense, and science and technology in two stages before the end of this century? Of course we should: However, this is only one task we should fulfill in order to realize our party's basic program. It is a grand task, but not the party's basic task; still less is it the whole task of our party. The "four modernizations" were set forth as a plan in connection with the development of the national economy. Substituting the fake for the genuine, however, "The General Program" stipulates realization of the "four modernizations" as the main prerequisite for all work at present and in the coming 25 years, calling on us to carry out all our work in light of this prerequisite.

This fully shows that, in the opinion of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party, the only task at present as well as in the coming 25 years and in the entire historical period of socialism is to undertake production and construction. Then, class struggle, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat would be done away with. This completely negates the party's basic program and thoroughly alters the basic mission and orientation of advance for the whole party and the people of the whole country.

After setting forth this main prerequisite, paying no heed to class struggle and socialist revolution, "The General Program" changes its tone and alleges that "'taking the three directives as the key link' is the general program for all work at present as well as in the future, including the coming 25 years." Thus, it ridiculously distorts Chairman Mao's important instructions, including the one on the question of theory, into something serving only the purpose of achieving the "four modernizations." This is an out-and-out distortion of Chairman Mao's instructions.

Those who practice eclecticism and sophistry oppose dialectics and pay no attention to dialectical logic. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the party and his "General Program" have even failed to pay attention to formal logic or reasoning. Under the pretext of "an inseparable total entity," he arbitrarily dished out the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and immediately turned it into a General Program for all work of the whole party and the whole country in the coming 25 years. Didn't he impose it on the people? It is precisely with this tactic that the unrepentant capitalist roader in the party negated class struggle as the key link, negated the party's basic line and dished out a revisionist program which is in basic opposition to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. It has nothing to do with Chairman Mao's instructions.

It is not accidental that "The General Program" begins and ends with a call for realizing the "four modernizations." This has raised a question of utmost importance-- what historical course China should take in the future, including the coming 25 years. We hold that our country is now in an important historical period of development. Should we adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, carry the socialist revolution through to the end, build our country into an ever greater and more prosperous socialist state and gradually march toward communism? Or should we practice revisionism, turn things back, restore the old order and take the beaten track of Soviet social-imperialism?

The next several decades will certainly be a period in which a fierce struggle between the two roads and the two futures will continue. To work for the basic interests of the Chinese people and the people of the world, we must struggle for the first future and against the second future. The party's basic line is the only correct one for achieving this purpose, which is the lifeline of the proletariat and revolutionary people. Therefore, Chairman Mao has repeatedly pointed out: "Never forget classes and class struggle." "We must remind ourselves of" the party's basic line "every year, every month and every day."

Since that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party wanted to substitute "taking the three directives as the key link" for the party's basic line and negate class struggle as the key link, he actually wanted to have the second future and to oppose the first future. As a matter of fact, his so-called "realization of the 'four modernizations'" is nothing but a blueprint for an all-round restoration of capitalism. With regard to this revisionist line, the whole party, the whole army and the people of the whole country of course want to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against it.

2. Does "taking the three directives as the key link" really include the study of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat? This is completely false and is aimed at deceiving people. Only by taking a look at how "The General Program" distorts and opposes Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat will people be able to understand the tricks played by the revisionists.

At the end of 1974, Chairman Mao issued an important instruction on the question of theory: "Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? This question must be thoroughly understood. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation."

In dealing with the socialist system, Chairman Mao said: "In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation she was similar to a capitalist country. Even now she practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution to each according to his work and exchange by means of money, which are scarcely different from those of the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has changed." Chairman Mao pointed out: "At present, our country practices a commodity system; the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat such things can only be restricted. Therefore, if people like Lin Biao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. That is why we should do more reading of Marxist-Leninist works."

The main feature of Chairman Mao's instruction is the emphasis on the necessity and importance of restricting bourgeois rights in combating and preventing revisionism, further pointing out to us the orientation of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the superstructure and the economic base. However, what does "The General Program" say about the instruction on the question of theory? It totally casts aside the main theme of Chairman Mao's instruction--the question of restricting bourgeois rights. Not a word was mentioned. In "The General Program" no trace can be found of the bourgeois rights that create the soil and conditions engendering a new bourgeoisie, of the main danger of revisionism, of struggle between the two lines within the party or of the capitalist roaders. This shows clearly that so-called "taking the three directives as the key link" is for the sole purpose of distorting and negating Chairman Mao's instruction on the question and the theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Negating the theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat shows, in essence, the bourgeois nature of the capitalist roaders. Chairman Mao noted bluntly in his recent remarks: "With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois rights they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road."

Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist viewpoint profoundly shows the errors in the line committed by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party and also the ideological and class origins of the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts which he stirred. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the party fears precisely that, with the socialist revolution, he himself is under fire. Thus, the bourgeois rights the capitalist roaders hold dear would be restricted and their class stand and world outlook would be affected as well. Consequently, he hurriedly dished out "taking the three directives as the key link" to oppose taking class struggle as the key link, to distort and tamper with Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, and to advocate the theory of the dying out of class in order to protect bourgeois interests both inside and outside the party.

Confronting the Marxist revolutionary spearhead and fearing that their class would soon die out, those who called themselves communists but who actually represent the interests of the bourgeoisie have invariably used every trick and means to distort and castrate the revolutionary content of Marxism and to blunt its revolutionary spearhead in order to serve the needs of the bourgeoisie. Is this not what that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party and his "General Program" want to accomplish? Do things stop here. No.

Those who negate taking class struggle as the key link and advocate the theory of the dying out of classes have always wanted to do away with the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. They, however, never want to stop any attack by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

While opposing class struggle, "The General Program" belligerently attacks the proletariat. This shows precisely the salient feature of this class struggle. Our party's fundamental theory and practice tell us that the principal contradiction throughout the period of socialism is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and that the main danger is revisionism. The target of the revolution is the bourgeoisie, and the key point is the capitalist roaders in power in the party.

However, what does "The General Program" publicize? Brandishing the banner of opposing the "ultraleft," it alleges that "the principle problem at present is that some class enemies who oppose Marxism and who inherited Lin Piao's mantle have always taken over our revolutionary slogans and then distorted and castrated them. They struck down our party's fine cadres and advanced model personalities." It even alleges that "this struggle is the concentrated expression of the current struggle between the two classes, roads and lines."

"The General Program" here uses the term "class enemies who oppose Marxism" to cover up its class feature. To whom does it allude? Does it allude to the capitalist roaders in the party? No, "The General Program's" concept of capitalist roaders in the party is comparable to the scabs on Ah Q's head about which Ah Q uttered not a single word; nor did he want others to mention them. Does it allude to the landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, bad elements, and old and new bourgeois elements? No, because the "General Program" explains clearly that these people are not included in "class enemies who oppose Marxism."

In fact, in light of this "inseparable total entity" in which they alleged that persisting in class struggle as the key link means opposing "taking the three directives as the key," the so-called "class enemies who separated revolutionary slogans" mentioned here are precisely those members of the CCP who persist in Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line; they are Marxists who persevere in taking class struggle as the key link.

Taking a bourgeois reactionary stand, they brand all revolutionary people who persist in exercising the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie as "class enemies." They do this in both articles and in practice. They changed Lin Piao's ultrarightist revisionist line into an "ultraleft" one. In this way, they can use such phrases as "inheriting Lin Piao's mantle" to attack all revolutionary people who criticize revisionism and right-opportunism. They can attack the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius and thereby display the revisionist lines of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao as treasures.

The landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, bad elements, old and new bourgeois elements, the unrepentant capitalist roaders, and those who want to reverse verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and settle scores with it fully appreciate and are delighted that the words in their mouths are expressed in Hu Feng-type rhetoric: "Inheriting Lin Piao's mantle: We do not inherit even Liu Shao-chi's mantle," and "take over revolutionary slogans and then distort and separate them."

"The General Program" also attacks class struggle and the struggle between the two lines, alleging that "they struck down our party's fine cadres and advanced model personalities." This is sheer fabrication and slander. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the party once said: "Policy must be implemented well for veteran workers and experienced cadres because the movement once started will often hurt them." The words embodied in "The General Program" are copied from the remarks cited. The phrase "the movement once started" includes all the important struggles between the two lines waged by our party in the past, thus totally negating them.

We should ask: From criticizing Chen Tu-hsiu, Li Li-san, Chu Chiu-pai, Lo Chang-lung, Wang Ming and Chang Kuo-tao to Kao Kang, Peng Te-huai, Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, did the "movement once started," hurt experienced cadres and workers? Did it "strike down the party's fine cadres and advanced model personalities?" Is this not a distortion and slander of the series of political movements carried out by our party under Chairman Mao's leadership, including the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution? Here, "The General Program" completely lays bare its reactionary features by pointing the spearhead at Chairman Mao and his proletarian revolutionary line. We say: "The movement once started will hurt people. However, it will not always hurt experienced cadres and workers. It will hurt those veteran chieftains of the revisionist line and the erroneous line they peddle. If we do not struggle against their erroneous line, our party cannot thrive, nor can it lead the people to triumphantly pursue socialist revolution in furtherance of democratic revolution, nor can it keep on advancing toward communism."

The unrepentant capitalist roaders in the party may still grieve over the fact that "the movement once started" may hurt the revisionist line. They want to reverse verdicts and write our party's history upside down. However, they are dreaming. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the party wants to reverse verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and settle scores with it. He is frenziedly engaged in activities to restore capitalism in all spheres by adhering to his program of "taking the three directives as the key link." He clamors repeatedly about "readjustment." How is the "readjustment" to be done? "The General Program" spells out clearly that it is necessary to "readjust" work in all fields by "taking the three directives as the key link." Industry should be "readjusted." Agriculture should be "readjusted." Communications and transport should be "readjusted." Finance and trade should be "readjusted." Science and technology should be "readjusted." Literature and art should be "readjusted." The troops should be "readjusted." The party should also be "readjusted." My goodness, nine major "readjustments"!

Everything, from the economic base to the superstructure, from within the party to outside it, from the localities to the central authorities, has gone amiss and must be "readjusted." Nothing is omitted. It is nothing less than a net from which there is no escape.

We also say that certain work in certain fields should be consolidated. This is aimed at further implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, principles and policies, and at better carrying out our work. What then is the all-inclusive "readjustment" which that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party wants to carry out? We have already seen it very clearly through the struggle to beat back the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in such fields as education, science and technology, literature and art, and public health.

It is precisely the "readjustment" with which that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party attempted to reverse verdicts of the Cultural Revolution, to settle accounts with it and to go back to the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao.

In calling for an all-round "readjustment," he actually attempted to launch an all-out vengeful counterattack and restore capitalism in an all-round way. If there were cases in which "some people practice revisionism by waving the banner of combating revisionism and carry out restoration by waving the banner of opposing restoration" as described in "The General Program," these would be self-portrayals of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the party and of "The General Program" of 'taking the three directives as the key' that he advocated.

3. On the question of the relationship between politics and economics and between revolution and production, "The General Program" distorts or tampers with Chairman Mao's instructions in a significant way. Making no mention of class struggle or of socialist revolution in economics, it puts development of the national economy into the orbit of the revisionist theory of productive forces.

We all know that the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production in our country has for the most part been completed but not totally. In fields where socialist transformation has been carried out, a fierce struggle between transformation and antitransformation and between restoration and antirestoration is still going on. There is still the question of continuing to deepen the socialist revolution in relations between men and in distribution. While carrying out socialist construction, therefore, we must strive to solve various problems in production relations and do a good job in making revolution in the superstructure. In other words, we must grasp class struggle as the key link, grasp revolution and promote production.

"The General Program" is opposed to the correct policy of grasping revolution and promoting production. It tries its best to attack the Great Cultural Revolution, saying: "Since the Cultural Revolution began, full attention has been given only to politics, with no attention given to the economy. Full attention has been given only to revolution, with no attention given to production. Whenever some people want to grasp production and do a good job in economic construction, they will be regarded as peddlers of the theory of productive forces and as revisionists."

This kind of attack exposes the reactionary stand of "The General Program" in upholding revisionism and the theory of the productive forces.

Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution began, the masses of revolutionary people have used Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to conduct revolutionary mass criticism of the revisionist line peddled by Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and the theory of productive forces they promoted. This kind of mass criticism is a class struggle waged by the proletariat to smash to smithereens the restoration of capitalism. This is precisely what "The General Program" tries to smear--"full attention has been given only to politics, with no attention given to the economy. Full attention has been given only to revolution, with no attention given to production."

However, many facts show that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a gigantic motive force in the development of productive forces in China.

The mass criticism of the revisionist line and of the theory of productive forces has promoted the development of productive forces and won tremendous achievements. Are the masses correct in labeling Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and their like revisionists and persons upholding the theory of productive forces? Absolutely correct! These two labels are quite appropriate. They should not be removed. Lenin said it well: "The negation of revisionism is aimed at covering up one's own revisionism."

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the party and his "General Program" negate the criticism against revisionism and the theory of productive forces simply because he seeks to inherit the mantle of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and to continue peddling the counter-revolutionary revisionist line and the theory of productive forces. He says that we give full attention to politics, but not to the economy, and that we give full attention to revolution, but not to production. This is certainly calling black white and trying to confuse right and wrong.

Let us say something: Relying on their own efforts, the 800 million people have ample food to eat and ample clothes to wear. They have established their own system for the development of the national economy by upholding the principle of maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts, and smashed to pieces the economic blockade and blackmail by imperialism and social-imperialism. Do you call this "paying no attention to economy and production"? Eating food produced by the masses, wearing clothes made by the masses and living in houses built by the masses, you utter such nonsense as "paying no attention to the economy and production." This is indeed shameless slander of the party and the masses and cadres persistently fighting on the forefront of industrial and agricultural production.

The difference between Marxism and revisionism and the theory of productive forces is not in regard to the question of whether it is necessary to grasp production and do a good job in economic construction. Marxism has always attached great importance to the development of productive forces. However, Marxism has also held at all times that the development of productive forces cannot be separated from the production relations and from the transformation of the superstructure. Only by grasping revolution will it be possible to promote production. The adjustment in the production relations will pave the way for the development of productive forces. Man is the most important productive force. As long as proletarian politics is placed in command of everything and man's enthusiasm for socialism is fully aroused under socialist conditions, production will advance at a swift pace.

However, those who peddle the theory of productive forces want neither class struggle nor socialist revolution in the superstructure and production relations. They regard the development of production as the only decisive thing. This is the essence of the issue. If we devote ourselves to production and construction without paying much attention to class struggle and revolution and let revisionism prevail and capitalism stage a comeback, as the unrepentant capitalist roader within the party preaches, the developed economy, production and "four modernizations" will become the material forces in oppressing and enslaving the proletariat and the working people.

Immediately after the October revolution, Lenin repeatedly reminded the party and the people that "90 percent of our attention and activities are and should be centered on basic issues--the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of proletarian political power and the elimination of all possibilities for capitalist restoration."

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the party and his "General Program" feverishly attack others for "paying no attention to the economy and production." Is he really interested in socialist production? No. His only interests are developing capitalist production and undermining the socialist production relations and the productive forces. His plans to "do a good job in production" are actually aimed at restoring capitalist wares. This is clearly stipulated in "The General Program" on enterprise management. "The General Program" says: "Following the development of production and technology, rules and relations will become more and more strict. The demands on people to follow these rules and regulations will become greater and greater. This is not only true in the capitalist society, but also in the socialist society. It will also be true in the communist society of the future."

This kind of allegation totally negates the class nature of setting up rules and regulations and ignores the differences among socialism, communism and capitalism. We understand that rules and regulations reflect human production relations. They have a clear-cut class nature. The rules and regulations set by the economic system in capitalist society are aimed at oppressing and fleecing the working class and laboring people. Ours is a socialist nation in which the working class and the laboring people are the masters of society. We rely on the working class and laboring people in setting up rules and regulations suitable to the development of socialist economy. We oppose anarchy. We also object to control, restriction and repression of the workers and laboring people and to the bourgeoisie's exercising dictatorship over them.

The Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company personally approved by Chairman Mao is the basic principle for socialist enterprises in setting their rules and regulations. "The General Program" says nothing about this charter but rants about "setting more and more strict rules and regulations." The rules and regulations set by the economic system of capitalism are indeed strict and rigorous. The workers are allowed to stay in the toilet for only a designated period of time. They are punished in various ways if they are found to exceed the designated period of time.

"The General Program" regards such rules and regulations as "supraclass" and "supra-mundane," claiming that "this is not only true in the capitalist society, but also in the socialist society and in the communist society." What could this be if not an attempt to restore capitalism? What could it be if not an attempt to exercise dictatorship over the working class and the laboring people?

Carefully examining other words and deeds of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the party, we can see even more clearly that he dished out the fallacies of "taking the three directives as the key link" and of "taking the development of national economy as the key link too" in order to implement his revisionist line and that, be it a white cat or a black one and be it imperialism or Marxism, he is advocating capitalism, not socialism.

4. The fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link" is made up of Marxist phrases and eclectic sleight of hand. It is a hypocritical and reactionary revisionist program. "The General Program" which peddles the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link" manifests the same characteristics. Theoretically unsound, it is a clumsy trick. It is a hodgepodge of mixed-up logic and contradictory theory. However, it can help us to further understand and criticize the reactionary essence of the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link." From this point of view, it is a valuable lesson by negative example for all of us.

To criticize, in depth, the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link" is of great significance to us in upholding Marxism and combating revisionism and in following socialism and opposing capitalism. A political program can be a long thesis or a simple general outline. But, be it a long thesis or a short outline, it invariably involves the principled question of whether we should uphold Marxism or revisionism and whether we should adhere to or oppose the theoretical basis for the proletarian party.

The revolutionary teacher of the proletariat has always attached great importance to the principled nature and purity of the proletarian political program. He always adopted a clear-cut stand to wage irreconcilable struggles against all kinds of opportunist and revisionist programs. He always deeply and thoroughly criticized them in the fields of politics and ideology and pointed out the correct direction for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. In the "Critique of the Gotha Programme," Marx said: "It is my duty not to give recognition, even by diplomatic silence, to what in my opinion is a thoroughly objectionable program that demoralizes the party." When the opportunist Duerhing emerged to oppose the party's theoretical basis, Engels intended to criticize Duerhing. Marx firmly supported this view. Engels then said with determination: "Let us put everything aside and deal with this nuisance--Duerhing."

On the question regarding the theoretical basis of Marxism, we must adopt a serious, militant attitude. The mistaken views and slogans on the question of the theoretical basis will often lead people to run counter to Marxism and to take the evil path of revisionism. When Khrushchev put forward the revisionist line of "peaceful transition," Chairman Mao sharply pointed out: "Is the October Revolution any good? Can it still be regarded as an example for all other nations? Khrushchev's report delivered at the 20th CPSU Congress said that one could seize political power through the parliamentary road. This is to say that all nations can no longer learn from the October Revolution. If this door is open, Leninism will for the most part be lost."

When Liu Shao-chi put forward the "contradiction between the four cleans and the four uncleans" in the socialist education movement, Chairman Mao realized that this sought to deny the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the principal contradiction and to ignore the fact that in socialist society there still exist classes, class contradictions and class struggle. He pointed out: "If one forgets this fundamental theory and practice of our party in the past 10 years, we will go astray." When Lin Piao dished out his revisionist theoretical program--"The Theory of Innate Genius"--Chairman Mao's timely pointed out its reactionary nature and said: "Do heroes make history? Do slaves make history? Is man's knowledge (talent belongs to the realm of knowledge) innate or post-natal? Should we follow idealist apriorism or the materialistic theory of reflection? This involves a cardinal question between right and wrong and between the two classes, two lines and two types of world outlook." He called on the whole party to take the Marxist stand and draw a clear demarcation line between it and Lin Piao's revisionism.

Today, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the party dished out the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link." By the same token, this is not a simple issue. It involves the question of whether we should uphold our party's basic program and basic line and whether we consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat or restore capitalism.

In order to uphold Marxism and defend the theoretical basis of the proletarian party and in order to prevent it from being altered or distorted, we must fight and thoroughly criticize the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link." We believe that through the struggle to hit back at the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts and through the thorough criticism of the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link," our party and the revolutionary cause of the proletariat will certainly advance at a quick pace and win still greater victories.

PLA OFFICIAL HSIAO HSIANG-JUNG DIES 23 MAR

Peking NCHA Domestic Service in Chinese 1410 GMT 3 Apr 76 03

[Text] Peking, 3 April 1976--Comrade Hsiao Hsiang-jung, deputy political commissar and deputy secretary of the party committee of the PLA's Science and Technology Commission for National Defense, failed to respond to medical treatment and died of illness on 23 March 1976 in Peking at the age of 66.

A memorial ceremony for Comrade Hsiao Hsiang-jung was held on the afternoon of 2 April at the auditorium of the Papaoshan Cemetery of Fallen Revolutionaries. Wreaths were sent by the Military Commission of the CCP Central Committee, the headquarters of the PLA General Staff, the PLA General Political Department, the PLA General Logistics Department and other units as well as friends of the late Comrade Hsiao Hsiang-jung. The memorial service was presided over by Hsu Li-ching, deputy director of the PLA General Political Department. Tao Lu-chia, political commissar of the Science and Technology Commission for National Defense, delivered the memorial speech.

Comrade Hsiao Hsiang-jung joined the Chinese Communist Youth League in 1926. He became a member of the Chinese Communist Party in 1929 and joined the Chinese Workers and Peasants Red Army in 1932. He served as secretary general of county and provincial CCP committees; county party committee secretary; director of the Secretariat of the party Central Committee; propaganda secretary, secretary general, United Front Work Department chief and Propaganda Department chief under the Political Department of the First Army Group and the General Political Department of the Red Army; Army Political Department director and political commissar; political department director of the South China Military Region; first deputy director of the Political Department of the Central-South Military Region; director of the General Office of the Military Commission of the CCP Central Committee; director of the General Office of the Ministry of National Defense, and deputy secretary general of the Military Commission of the CCP Central Committee. He was elected a deputy to the Third National People's Congress.

It was pointed out in the memorial speech that Comrade Hsiao Hsiang-jung was a good member of the Chinese Communist Party. For several decades, under the leadership of Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee, in protracted revolutionary struggles and in socialist revolution and socialist construction, he assiduously studied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, implemented Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, and persisted in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He was loyal to the party and the people, worked diligently and conscientiously, was faithful and active, straight and serious in his style of work, and open and aboveboard. Even recently during his illness, he continued to conscientiously study Chairman Mao's important instructions and actively participated in the movement to beat back the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts.