

A decade ago, Chairman Mao joined the masses in riding the winds and waves in a robust swim in the Yangtze River for 1 hour and 5 minutes. Chairman Mao's great feat was a tremendous encouragement to the millions upon millions of army men and people of the whole country in their endeavor to temper their revolutionary will amid great winds and waves.

In Wuhan, up to 10,000 people swim across the Yangtze River each year on 16 July. This year, swimming activities have already started with some 5 million people participating. In Hangchow, 10,000 people will be organized to swim across the Chientang River on 16 July. Since the advent of summer, swimming activities have been in full swing in the northern city of Harbin, with some 10,000 people going to swim each day. Even in such hilly areas as Kansu's Liangtang County, mass swimming activities have been unfolded in simply built swimming pools. The swimming movement is also gathering strength among women and in factories.

"Resolutely carrying out Chairman Mao's instruction, the commanders and fighters of the PLA have conscientiously learned swimming and tried hard to master aquatic skills. A certain regiment under the Kunming PLA units holds armed swimming training each year and armed fighters have swum across the Chinsha River 13 times, across the Lantsang River 22 times, across the Hungho River 12 times and across the Tienchih Lake 14 times. The regiment will continue the training program this year across the Hungho River."

Similar swimming training is also carried out by other PLA units. A certain regiment attached to the Fukien Front PLA units has intensified swimming training activities over the sea, and armed fighters recently have swum across a bay 2,5000 meters in width. A certain unit under the Tsinan PLA units stationed near the Yellow River has sponsored armed swimming training across the Yellow River.

"To greet the 10th anniversary of Chairman Mao's robust swim in the Yangtze River and to whip up a new high tide of mass swimming, general surveys of swimmers were conducted in various localities in the spring. According to preliminary statistics, some 2,019,000 people in Tientsin Municipality have mastered the skill of swimming. This is 29 percent of the city's total population. Woman swimmers total over 440,000. In Kwangtung Province, about 13.91 million people can swim, or 26 percent of the province's total population. Over 2.4 million are woman swimmers. In the province's Tungwan County, which is called the 'home of swimmers,' 49.4 percent of the masses can swim, and most of the commune members and youngsters have mastered that skill. The results of the general surveys on swimmers conducted in various localities indicate that in response to Chairman Mao's great call for unfolding swimming activities and encouraged by the great feat of his robust swim in the Yangtze River, mass swimming activities in China have made great headway, with the number of swimmers increasing daily. This is a vigorous criticism of the fallacy 'the present is not as good as the past' spread by unrepentant capitalist roader within the party Teng Hsiao-ping."

RED FLAG SCORES TENG'S ECONOMIC POLICIES

Peking Domestic Service in Mandarin 0900 GMT 15 Jul 76 OW

[Apparent text of article published in RED FLAG No 7 by Kao Lu and Chang Ko: "Comment on Teng Hsiao-ping's Comprador-Bourgeois Economic Concept"]

[Text] Teng Hsiao-ping peddled many fallacies on economic construction. A sinister line runs through all these fallacies.

Internally, he sought to seize leadership of the national economy from the proletariat on behalf of the bourgeoisie and turn our country's socialist economy into a bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalist economy and externally, he sought to practice capitulationism and national betrayal in a vain attempt to turn our country into a colony or semicolony of imperialism and social-imperialism. This is in essence a kind of comprador-bourgeois economic concept.

To restore capitalism, Teng Hsiao-ping dished out a reactionary program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and pushed a counterrevolutionary revisionist line and a set of corresponding principles and policies. Behind the back of the party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, he reimposed the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned," and advocated things like the rules and regulations of the Magnitogorsk iron and steel combine of the Soviet Union. His purpose was to replace the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and change the nature of our country's socialist economy into a bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalist economy.

As early as 1956, Chairman Mao in his report "On Ten Sets of Major Relationships" pointed out: "To consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, strengthen the socialist economic base and build a powerful socialist country, it is necessary correctly to handle the relationship between the central and local authorities. It is necessary to let the localities undertake more work under unified central planning to give play to both central and local initiatives."

However, Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping vigorously opposed Chairman Mao's instruction and for a long time refused to implement this correct policy. Instead, they heaped praises on the big trusts in imperialist countries and energetically enforced the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned."

In the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao were destroyed. The broad masses and revolutionary cadres rose in rebellion against the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" and pushed forward the implementation of the correct policy of Chairman Mao.

Since the start of the Great Cultural Revolution, the situation in which grain had to be transported north from the south and coal had to be transported south from the north, has begun to change. Such natural resources as coal, petroleum and natural gas have been discovered one after another in the south. Small local industries such as iron, steel, chemical fertilizer, cement, machine building and electricity have developed vigorously, and the output of such industries has multiplied. By developing such local industries some small and medium-sized cities have developed themselves into new industrial cities. All this proves the correctness of Chairman Mao's instruction: "It is far better for the initiative to come from two sources than from only one." This instruction is of great, far-reaching significance in developing the national economy with greater, faster, better and more economical results.

After he resumed work, Teng Hsiao-ping relapsed into error and reimposed the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned." Under the pretext of "centralized and unified leadership," he tried to bring under central control all the key enterprises that serve the whole country and require organized cooperation and coordination on a nationwide scale.

If he were allowed to have his way, the overwhelming majority of the big enterprises as well as all small and medium ones which cooperate with or serve the big ones would be brought under central control. In such a case, the initiative of the localities and masses would be dampened and the cause of socialist construction would be undermined. This attempt by Teng Hsiao-ping fully shows that he obdurately opposed Chairman Mao's policy of giving full scope to the initiative from two sources and tried to reverse verdicts of the Great Cultural Revolution, to continue pushing his revisionist line and to take the beaten track of imperialist trust.

It was out of his political need to practice revisionism and establish a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie that Teng Hsiao-ping pushed the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" in the economic field. "Direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" is the opposite of centralized leadership by the party. The so-called "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" was meant for but a few persons in the central departments concerned to give orders directly to enterprises and impose vertical-line leadership, with each vertical line becoming a system in itself, reaching directly to the bottom, depriving both the party Central Committee and the local party committees of economic power and pushing aside the centralized leadership of party committees at all levels. "Direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" meant having nothing to do with either the party Central Committee or the local party committees. It meant excessive decentralization and setting up many "centers" on the central level, and autocracy on the local level and among the masses.

Experience in class struggle in the socialist period shows that the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" is conducive to the capitalist roaders pushing a revisionist line from above. In the last year, in the departments more seriously influenced by Teng Hsiao-ping's practice of "direct and exclusive control," the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts was more pronounced, and the capitalist roaders' restorationist activities were more flagrant. This was by no means accidental. Teng Hsiao-ping's aim in reimposing the practice of "direct and exclusive control" was to "readjust" our socialist economy until it disappeared. The practice of "direct and exclusive control" inevitably will result in the dividing up of the socialist economy of ownership by all of the people into private properties of departments in "direct and exclusive control" of various individual trades and industries. This will result in serious barriers between different departments and trades, separated from one another because of a division of labor, even to the extent of "dumping rubbish in the neighbor's yard" and each trying to cut the feet from under the other; thus, the relationship between departments will be changed into a capitalist relationship of competition. The practice of "direct and exclusive control" will lead to the ignoring of the overall balance among various sectors of the national economy and the one-sided stressing of the needs of each department, undermining rational overall planning of the national economy and the comprehensive utilization of resources and hindering large-scale socialist cooperation and coordination among departments. In short, the practice of "direct and exclusive control" basically runs counter to the principle of taking class struggle as the key link and putting proletarian politics in command, runs counter to the concept of viewing the situation as a whole in socialist construction and the mass viewpoint, undermines the socialist planned economy and the socialist relations of production, and hinders the development of the productive forces.

Who, after all, exercises the so-called "direct and exclusive control?" It is obvious that in Teng Hsiao-ping's mind "direct and exclusive control" was to be exercised by the capitalist roaders in the party and the unreformed bourgeois technical experts.

He suggested that the center of "readjustments" was the leading bodies, and set his mind on planting the capitalist readers who were not afraid of being overthrown for a second time in various departments. What he wanted was to usurp the leadership of the entire national economy on behalf of the bourgeoisie inside and outside the party. It is obvious that to "readjust" the economy by departments under Teng Hsiao-ping's "direct and exclusive control" was meant to bring about capitalist concentration and monopoly of production, to implement his revisionist wares such as "let specialists run factories," "put profit in command," "material incentives," "production first" and "technique above everything else" to negate Chairman Mao's line and policies on the socialist revolution and construction, to expand and strengthen bourgeois rights, to change the socialist orientation and road of our enterprises, and to turn the socialist economy into a bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalist economy.

In reviving the practice of "direct and exclusive control" in the management system of the national economy, Teng Hsiao-ping pushed such things as the rules and regulations of the Magnitogorsk iron and steel combine of the Soviet Union in the enterprises and enforced the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the workers. These were the two aspects in his attempt to establish bureaucrat-monopoly capitalism.

Chairman Mao pointed out as early as 1964: "Management itself is a matter of socialist education. If the managerial staff do not join the workers on the shop floor, work, study and live with them and modestly learn one or more skills from them, then they will find themselves locked in acute class struggle with the working class all their lives and in the end are bound to be overthrown as bourgeois by the working class."

Teng Hsiao-ping always opposed Chairman Mao's instruction that it is necessary to rely wholeheartedly on the working class and stubbornly pushed his revisionist line that was hostile to the working class. He openly advocated that reliance on the workers, peasants and soldiers is relative, and did not at all regard them as masters of the country. He negated their right to manage the economy. He had bitter hatred for the revolutionary action by the working class in criticizing the capitalist and revisionist principles and regulations concerning enterprise management in the course of the Great Cultural Revolution. Thus, once he took up work again he hurriedly launched a vengeful counterattack against the working class. He not only wanted to reimpose all the past measures for controlling, checking and suppressing the masses of workers, but blustered that he wanted these measures strictly enforced. This fully revealed that he was the general representative of the bourgeois elements who sucked the blood of the workers, and who were sharply criticized by Chairman Mao.

Implementation by enterprises of a given line and the leadership of a given class over such enterprises determine that the enterprises belong to that class. If Teng Hsiao-ping's revisionist line were allowed to continue, the leadership of our enterprises would certainly be in the hands of the capitalist readers or the bourgeoisie in the party. They would use their power to appropriate and spend freely large amounts of wealth created by the working class and ride roughshod over the workers. In such a case, socialist enterprises would exist only in name and turn into bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalist ones.

The fallacies peddled by Teng Hsiao-ping were not his own creations or inventions, but were acquired by him from Soviet revisionism as refurbished versions of the so-called economic reforms of Khrushchev and Brezhnev. To develop bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalism, the Soviet revisionists have gone all out to push the so-called "new economic system" with "material incentives" and "putting profit in command" as its core.

Vigorously practicing "techniques above everything else" and "letting experts run factories," they have put the leadership over the national economy in the hands of the bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalist class. Their regulations concerning enterprises explicitly stipulate that the manager of an enterprise has the right to sell, convey or lease means of production of the enterprise and to recruit or dismiss workers. Allowed to do whatever he pleases to workers, he exercises bourgeois dictatorship over them. Above the enterprises there are systems at two or three levels--the central ministries concerned and joint production companies--through which vertical-line leadership is exercised and direct and exclusive control is enforced. Such joint production companies are large in scale and have all the powers and functions of enterprise management. It is through the practice of the "new economic system" that the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has strengthened its monopoly and control of all enterprises throughout the Soviet Union.

The reality of Soviet revisionism is a mirror in which we see clearly what misery the masses of laboring people will be thrown into once the socialist economy is turned into a bureaucrat-monopoly-capitalist economy. Today, the people in the Soviet Union are powerless politically, exploited economically, and in an abyss of suffering. The ninth 5-year plan, which Soviet revisionism bragged about as a welfare plan, has gone bankrupt. The industrial growth rate has been dropping year after year, agriculture is a mess, the proportions of various sectors of the national economy are seriously upset, and the contradictions between the masses of workers and peasants on the one hand and the handful of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class on the other are becoming more and more acute. All this is causing Soviet social-imperialism's political and economic crises to be aggravated continuously. By trying to follow in the footsteps of Soviet revisionism, Teng Hsiao-ping in the end could only seriously disrupt the socialist relations of production and the superstructure and wreck the socialist economy. How could it be possible to push our national economy forward? How could there be any so-called socialist modernization?

Chairman Mao pointed out: "Under China's historical conditions, all who stubbornly cling to the capitalist line are in fact people who are prepared to capitulate to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism."

Teng Hsiao-ping was exactly such a person. He felt that the Chinese people were no good at economic construction and the "four modernizations" and that the socialist system would not work either. He felt that the only way was to rely on the introduction of foreign technology and equipment to speed up industrial and technological transformation and raise labor productivity. For this purpose, he put forward a so-called gib policy, calling for the signing of long-term contracts with foreign countries, under which the most modern and best equipment would be supplied by foreign capitalists, to be paid for with minerals produced in our country. This was an out-and-out big capitulationist, traitorous policy of worshipping things foreign and toadying to foreigners.

Whether we can rely on the people's strength and our own efforts to build the economy or worship and be servile to everything foreign and rely on foreign countries are two diametrically opposed lines.

Chairman Mao has taught us: "Rely mainly on our efforts while seeking external assistance as an auxiliary, break down blind faith, go in for industry, agriculture and technical and cultural revolutions independently, do away with slavishness, bury dogmatism, learn conscientiously from the good experience of other countries, and be sure to study their bad experience too, so as to draw lessons from it. This is our line."

Teng Hsiao-ping has entirely betrayed this line set forth by Chairman Mao. The major policy that he talked about actually runs counter to the policy of building the economy on the basis of the Chinese people's strength. This is why he intended to use technology and equipment from foreign countries as a basis for doing so. This fully shows that the theme he harped about remains one of "white cat, black cat," which makes no distinction between Marxism and imperialism.

Whether to persistently maintain independence, keep the initiative in our own hands and rely on our own efforts, is not only an economic question but also primarily a political issue. Monopolizing advanced technology and equipment and relying on economic strength to throttle the other side and to commit blackmail, infiltration and expansion has long been a major trick used by imperialism and social-imperialism to control and plunder the other countries. In the world today if a country cannot maintain independence and keep the initiative in its own hands and be self-reliant economically, it can in no way maintain independence politically. Even if it can do so, such independence is not solid and is likely to fall under the control of the two superpowers.

Under the guidance of the policy of maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts, it may be entirely necessary to import certain technology and equipment from foreign countries to meet China's needs for socialist revolution and construction in accordance with the principle of equality and mutual benefit. But under no circumstances should we pin our hopes for achieving the modernization in the four fields on this point.

If we do not give our main attention to self-reliance but merely rely on bringing in foreign technology, copying foreign designs, using foreign processes and making equipment by following foreign models, as Teng Hsiao-ping proposed, then we can only ape the foreigners at every step and trail behind them at a snail's pace forever. As a consequence, not only is it impossible to catch up with and surpass the advanced world standards, but the technological development and even the entire national economy of our country will fall under the control of foreign monopoly capital. Some monopoly bourgeois economists have alleged that industrially backward countries can take off economically only by means of imperialist technology. Isn't it very satiric that the proposals of Teng Hsiao-ping, who holds the title of Communist Party member, should go so far as to be in much the same vein as their fallacy? This, of course, is neither an accident nor a coincidence but shows that Teng Hsiao-ping's economic proposals are in every way aimed at serving the imperialist needs.

The Soviet revisionist paper PRAVDA once pointed out that the Soviet Union can use its resources as security to absorb foreign capital and experience in the form of loans which can be paid off by certain amounts of products resulting from construction projects. Teng Hsiao-ping's major policy precisely falls in line with this Soviet revisionist measure. In essence it would sell out our natural resources and state sovereignty and occasion indebtedness to foreign countries in a disguised form. In addition, Teng Hsiao-ping shamelessly bragged about the three big advantages of his major policy: First, it can bring about export trade. Second, it can promote technical transformation. Third, it can make use of the labor force available. What advantages it has! Its essence is nothing more than a method of calling for the monopoly capitalists of foreign countries to provide money and equipment in exchange for Chinese manpower, thus paving the way for the imperialists to get a foothold into China's natural resources and to drain the Chinese people of their blood and sweat.

Such advantages were well understood by the Chinese people long before liberation.

If Teng Hsiao-ping's capitalist policy were put into practice, our country would have no alternative but gradually to turn itself into an imperialist and social-imperialist raw materials supply base, a commodity market and a place for capital investments. In this way, not only will the results of socialist revolution be wiped out altogether, but also the fruits of democratic revolution would be ruined. Is this not enough to expose the ugly feature of Teng Hsiao-ping as a representative of the big bourgeois interests of the foreign countries and an imperialist comprador?

Historical experience over the past century tells us that it is only an illusion to rely on imperialism to provide us with technology and loans for our economic development so as to make China rich and powerful. In the late Ching dynasty, those standing for the introduction of foreign things into China advocated the so-called "borrowing money for promoting profitable undertakings," holding that borrowing large sums of money from the imperialist countries with our country's natural resources as securities and using foreign technology to promote industry was the only basis for China to strengthen itself and the only way for the country to exist. But facts just proved the contrary. What they proposed entirely met the imperialists' needs for selling their commodities, exporting their capital and dividing China. The movement for introducing foreign things into China was not the basis for the country to strengthen itself but something which made the people poorer and poorer and deprived the country of more and more financial resources. It is not a way for the country to exist but something causing increasing crisis to the nation.

In the old semicolonial and semifuedal China, some people once were obsessed with building the country industrially. They regarded the lack of industry as the root cause for China's backwardness and poverty. In their opinion, as long as industry and commerce were developed on a large scale, China would certainly change from a poor and weak to a rich and powerful country. They had no courage to thoroughly oppose imperialism and fuedalism but only dreamed of developing the capitalist industry without overthrowing the imperialist rule. But under the twofold oppression of imperialism and its lackeys, the proposals to build the country industrially either met the fate of failure as soon as their advocates found them to be hopeless or the fate of falling into the embrace of imperialism just like the comprador bourgeoisie.

When Teng Hsiao-ping was young, he had the idea of saving the country by promoting industry. For decades his bourgeois stand and world outlook have not changed at all. With the incessant deepening of the revolution, his reactionary bourgeois character has been brought to light more and more. Teng Hsiao-ping first opposed the socialist revolution by engaging in restoration and retrogression, and then embarked on a capitulationist course betraying his country after inheriting the mantle of the comprador bourgeoisie. In the end, he is bound to meet the same disgraceful fate of slavish compradors in history.

Only socialism can save China. This is a historical conclusion the Chinese people have drawn from their protracted revolutionary struggle. The independence of China and the freedom and happiness of the Chinese people will be reduced to mere empty talk of we divorce ourselves from Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, The dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist road. The revolution is changing and can change everything. As long as we persist in implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, in taking class struggle as the key link, in maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands, and in relying on the enthusiasm and creativity of the vast majority of the people, we can certainly build our country into a strong socialist power with modern agriculture, industry, national defense and science and technology while continuing to march forward toward the great objective of communism.