

RED FLAG SCORES TENG ON ENTERPRISE CONTROL

Peking Domestic Service in Mandarin 0330 GMT 9 Sep 76 OW

[RED FLAG NO 9 article by Chi Ping: "The Reactionary Nature of the Practice of 'Direct and Exclusive Control of Enterprises by the Ministry Concerned' Reemphasized by Teng Hsiao-ping"]

[Text] With the struggle developing in depth to criticize Teng Hsiao-ping and repulse the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, the serious crime committed by Teng Hsiao-ping to reemphasize the practice of 'direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned' has been scathingly criticized by the worker-peasant-soldier masses and cadres.

In the course of criticizing the three big poisonous weeds bred by Teng Hsiao-ping-- "On the General Program", "An Outline Report" and "Regulations for Industry"--our efforts to continue criticizing the practice of 'direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned' promoted by Teng Hsiao-ping, expose its reactionary nature, destroy its class roots and ideological sources, and eliminate its pernicious influence, will constitute an important aspect in further criticizing Teng Hsiao-ping's revisionist line ideologically and politically.

Around summer last year, Teng Hsiao-ping formulated his reactionary program of taking the three directives as the key link, "promoted his counterrevolutionary revisionist line, vigorously stirred up the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, spread a whole set of revisionist fallacies, and committed a series of crimes. One of his crimes was to reemphasize the practice of 'direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned.'

Prior to the Great Cultural Revolution, Teng Hsiao-ping was always opposed to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and the correct policy of giving full play to the initiative of both central and local authorities laid down by Chairman Mao. In collaboration with Liu Shao-chi, he exerted great efforts in pushing the revisionist line and in practicing the 'direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned.' During the 3 years China encountered temporary difficulties in national economy, he and Liu Shao-chi hurriedly came out into the open to stage a vengeful counterattack and to vigorously "turn over enterprises to a higher level" and establish trusts.

The Great Cultural Revolution had destroyed the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao and criticized their revisionist line. It was natural that the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises" met with fierce blows from the masses of revolutionary people. However, Teng Hsiao-ping had resented this.

Soon after he resumed work, he once again took up the tattered revisionist ware of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned." With redoubled efforts and fanatical enthusiasm, he ground his teeth to energetically create counterrevolutionary public opinion for reestablishing the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned.'

The revisionist "Regulations for Industry" worked out on his instructions attacked the enterprises under the control of the local authorities as "a mess" and claimed that in these enterprises "many things are out of control" and that "no attention is being paid to the work of production management, thus affecting production.

He shouted loudly about "turning over" this and "liquidating" that. He came out into the open and personally supervised the operations. Waving the big stick of "rectification" he tried to reverse verdicts passed in the Great Cultural Revolution and strangle the new emerging things of socialism. He attempted to make use of the revisionist "Regulations for Industry" as rules to impose the "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" onto the party organizations at all levels and the broad masses.

Teng Hsiao-ping's efforts to blatantly reverse verdicts passed in the Great Cultural Revolution, reestablish the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" and attack the proletariat are aimed at restoring capitalism in an all-round manner.

The practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" means to resist the central authorities while suppressing the local authorities. It advocates that neither the party nor the masses should be trusted and that only the words of a few people count. It runs counter to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line of the proletariat, and it will invariably become the tool of the bourgeoisie inside the party in pushing the revisionist line and restoring capitalism.

This is precisely why all the chieftains of the opportunist line since the founding of new China practiced "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned." Teng Hsiao-ping did the same. He inherited the mantle of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and reimposed the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" in a vain attempt to carry the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" which he concocted and his counterrevolutionary revisionist line right down to the grassroots levels, to alter the basic line Chairman Mao formulated for our party and to turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Didn't Teng Hsiao-ping want to "turn over" and "unify" this and that? What, after all, did he want to "turn over" and "unify," and how? He wanted to turn over the party, government, financial and cultural powers from the hands of the proletariat into the hands of the capitalist roaders and to unify them under his program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and his counterrevolutionary revisionist line.

People could clearly see last year that in those departments which were more seriously influenced by Teng Hsiao-ping's practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts blew harder; the capitalist roaders were more blatant in their restorationist activities; the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" was pushed more vigorously; the slavish comprador philosophy was more popular; the theory of productive forces was pushed more flagrantly; and the "economic hurricane" and "hurricane for vocational work" were fanned up more wildly. At the same time, the revolutionary masses and revolutionary cadres were pushed aside and attacked; the new socialist things were trampled on and stifled; the people's socialist enthusiasm was suppressed; and revolution and production were undermined.

Practice has proved that the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" means the enforcement of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. It is a chain put around the neck of the proletariat and the revolutionary people by the bourgeoisie in the party.

To once again call for "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" was a major tactic employed by Teng Hsiao-ping to push the slavish comprador philosophy and rig up capitulation and national betrayal. Didn't he fervently advertise the "grand policy" of signing long-term contracts with foreign countries for the import of technology and equipment and using China's mineral products as payments? But, many localities and enterprises, together with their worker masses, firmly resisted this capitulationist policy of worshiping and toadying to foreign countries and selling out our national resources. Consequently Teng Hsiao-ping tried to forcibly practice this policy by way of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned." It was not a coincidence that, when Teng Hsiao-ping revived this stuff of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" last year, there was also a noisy rampage of the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of trailing behind at a snail's pace. This stuff is closely linked to the slavish comprador philosophy. The capitalist roaders inside the party who practice this stuff are bound to hire themselves out to the foreign bourgeoisie and trail behind the foreigners at a snail's pace because they are blind to the superiority of the socialist system and the great strength of the masses. On the other hand, given the condition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China, the slavish comprador philosophy can have its influence for a period of time only when there are capitalist roaders practicing "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" against the dictatorship of the proletariat. We know from our experiences, both positive and negative, that there will be room for the slavish comprador philosophy and doctrine of trailing behind at a snail's pace if "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" is not thoroughly criticized. If this stuff is not thoroughly repudiated, it will be impossible for Chairman Mao's principle of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts" to be carried through and for the vigorous creativeness of our country's proletariat and working people to be brought into full play.

"The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." To once again call for "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" and push the revisionist line represented the actual step taken by Teng Hsiao-ping in vainly attempting to destroy the economic base of socialism and turn the socialist ownership into that of capitalism. Under the smokescreen of "concentration" and "unification," he opposed the centralized and unified leadership of Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee and also ignored the centralized leadership of the local party committees to assert direct control of certain departments in an effort to practice leadership all the way from the top over the localities and enterprises to whom he gave orders at will in a dictatorial manner.

To exercise leadership over the socialist economy, the system of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" has basically ignored the party line and policies: Money and material have been used instead to exercise a dictatorial control over the localities and the masses. With regard to industrial development projects, closing of enterprise units, and establishment of factories, what Teng Hsiao-ping and a few others said counted. They even formulated so called "grand policy" at will in an attempt to sell out our national resources, state sovereignty and the fruits grown out of the toil of the working people. If this revisionist line has been implemented, there will be no dictatorship of the proletariat and no socialist economy.

Under these circumstances, the capitalist roaders, though nominally possessing no means of production, will be able to use their managerial power to actually possess and distribute the means of production. The socialist ownership by the whole people will be turned into a private ownership controlled by the capitalist roaders. Private ownership will become the economic base with which they can restore capitalism and exercise bourgeois dictatorship. The socialist enterprises will then degenerate into capitalist enterprises of bureaucrat monopoly. Isn't it exactly this process that the Soviet revisionists have experienced in creating bureaucrat-monopoly capitalism in their country?

The Chinese working class and other laboring people of China who have been tempered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius and are armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought will never permit the USSR tragedy of becoming a revisionist country to be repeated in China.

Teng Hsiao-ping reimposed the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" under the disguise of "developing production" and "realizing the four modernizations." He attacked the turning over of enterprises to the control of local authorities during the Great Cultural Revolution and slandered it as "affecting production development." He declared that production would increase only when the enterprises were handed over to the high-level units and "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" was imposed. This is utter nonsense to deceive people.

Abundant facts have time and again proved that "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" not only cannot promote production but impairs socialist production relationship and impedes the development of the socialist productive forces. This practice will make the ministries concerned into independent administrative systems implementing their own policies which they thought were right. It will turn the socialist cooperation relationship between the central departments and the local authorities, between the ministries concerned, and between the enterprises into capitalist competition. The competition will lead to the central departments, local authorities, ministries and enterprises being hostile to each other and involved in arguments and grudges against each other. The practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" will also lead the situation to such a degree as to permit the subordinate units under each ministry concerned to extend their hands to the local enterprises. This will create contradictions among the ministries and invite internal contradictions within each and every ministry concerned. Thus, the localities will not be able to accomplish overall planning for the comprehensive and balanced development of production and construction in their respective areas. This situation will seriously bind and frustrate the initiative of the local authorities and of the masses.

Furthermore, the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" is bound to undermine socialist cooperation, sabotage the comprehensive utilization of resources, impair the rational industrial planning, and impede the economic development in areas of national minorities. When this practice is in effect in the field of planning and other fields of work, only present and no long-range disadvantages or advantages will be taken into consideration for economic reasons; no political consideration will be taken into account. Big enterprise will be taken care of and the medium-sized and small enterprises will receive a cold shoulder.

Things foreign will be emphasized and indigenous methods brushed aside; experts will be esteemed and the masses ignored. This will not insure the thorough implementation of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and his series of principles and policies for the development of the national economy and guarantee the development of the national economy in a planned way and a proportional manner according to the precedence of "agriculture, light industry and heavy industry." Nor is it possible to simultaneously develop the big, medium-sized and small enterprises, using both indigenous and foreign ways; to launch mass movements in a big way in our economic construction; and to achieve greater, faster, better and more economic results in developing the socialist economy

With the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" in effect, the enterprises, in order to achieve competition, will have to advocate "profits in command" and "material incentive," rely on "experts to run factories" and exercise "control, check and suppress" over workers, thereby turning the relationship between men within the enterprises into the relationship between the employer and the employee, between the oppressor and the oppressed. How can this arouse the socialist production?

What we should rely on in developing socialist production is not the revisionist line and the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" but Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and the solution to questions of the superstructure and production relationship. We also should rely on the full play of the socialist enthusiasm of the broad masses. In his report on "the ten relations" in 1956, Chairman Mao pointed out: "It is far better for the initiative to come from two sources than from only one. Let the localities undertake more work under unified central planning." Applying our party's democratic centralism and mass line to economic construction, Chairman Mao's instruction pointed out the orientation for reforming our country's economic management system and the important task of continuing the revolution in the field of production relations and in the superstructure after the fundamental solution of the question of ownership.

Resolutely implementing the basic line, principles and policies formulated by Chairman Mao will enable us to mobilize all positive factors and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in developing our socialist undertakings. Since the Great Cultural Revolution, we have criticized the revisionist line and the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" and have given full play to the initiative of both the central and local authorities. This has resulted in the vigorous development of our national economy.

Take tractor production, for instance. The monopoly of tractor manufacture by central authorities alone was shattered during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. During the same period, full play was given to the initiative of both the central and local authorities and the latter were given a free hand to make tractors. As a result, output of tractors over the past 10 years was more than six times the output before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The increase in the output of the push-type tractors was still greater.

Thanks to the aroused initiative of local authorities, the coal output of the new shafts built in the 10 years after the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution equalled the total output of all existing shafts in the 17 years before the Cultural Revolution.

The completion of Shanghai's Chinshan project and Talien's Hsinkang projects is a great achievement in acting directly against the "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" and in the massive concerted efforts made by all trades and services under the leadership of local party committees.

These and many other such facts prove that the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" is bound to result in fewer, slower, poorer and more costly achievements, while giving play to the initiative of both the central and local authorities results in greater, faster, better and more economical achievements.

Why, then, during the socialist period should this practice have been advocated again and again? The basic reason is that the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party and that capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road. As capitalist roaders in the party like Teng Hsiao-ping have treasured it and relied on it to push the revisionist line, its danger and pernicious influence should not be underestimated. Of course, criticizing "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" does not mean writing off ministries or negating their roles. It means implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and giving fuller play to the initiative of both the central and local authorities under the unified planning of the central authorities.

We must continue our conscientious study of Chairman Mao's many important instructions on criticizing Teng Hsiao-ping and repulsing the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts and deepen criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping's counterrevolutionary revisionist line ideologically and politically. We must thoroughly criticize and fully discredit the practice of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned." We must take class struggle as the key link, adhere to the party's basic line and persist in the revolution in the superstructure and the production relations. We must continue our efforts to reform the economic management system and give full play to the socialist enthusiasm of the masses in order to promote the rapid development of socialist production.

CANTON TO HOLD SCHEDULED EXPORT FAIR

Hong Kong AFP in English 0615 GMT 13 Sep 76 OW

[Excerpt] Hong Kong, Sep 13 (AFP)--Left-wing sources confirmed today that preparations are continuing for next month's big Chinese autumn export fair in the south China city of Canton.

This is, in turn, considered by economists in Hong Kong as confirmation that there will be no change in China's economic and trade policies following the death of Chairman Mao Tsetung. Nor do observers expect that the political aftermath of the chairman's passing will be such as to affect to any significant extent China's foreign trade upon which much of the nation's economic viability depends. "China's leaders must have prepared for the inevitable, which will mean that there will not be too much political upheaval to affect production and trade," secretary-general of the Chinese Manufacturer's Association J.P. Lee said today.

In fact, observers pointed out, every time there is a disaster in China--whatever the form--there is a concerted national movement to increase industrial and agricultural production. This happened after the July 23 earthquake which hit key industrial centres in north China and again, after the chairman's death to "turn grief into strength."