

## TEXT 30

### A GENERAL PROGRAM FOR CAPITALIST RESTORATION

—An Analysis of “On the General Program for All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Nation”

*Cheng Yueh*

The great struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is pressing 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 come under penetrating criticism by Chairman Mao and by the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country. Chairman Mao pointed out: “**What! ‘Take 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.**” This instruction by Chairman Mao 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 under 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 Nation” (here under the “General Program” for short). In even blunter words, it thoroughly exposes the program of “taking the three directives as the key link” dished up by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party as a program for all-round capitalist restoration.

#### I.

The “General Program” begins with setting forth realization of the “four modernizations” as the objective of struggle for the Party in the next 25 years, and then proposes “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

*Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines #867 (76-11). (Translation of article in Hongqi [Red Flag] #4, 1976.)*

nation at present, but also the general work program in the entire course of struggle for fulfilling the grand goal during the next 25 years." This generalization pointedly shows that the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished up 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 the basic program and basic line of our Party.

What is the basic task for the whole Party and the people of the whole country in the entire historical period of socialism, including the coming 25 years? Our Party's Constitution in its "First Chapter—General Principles" clearly provides: "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 this basic program of our Party, 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 heighten 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 task for the whole Party and the people of the whole country not only at present but also throughout the entire historical period of socialism, including the next 25 years, is to fight for nothing but the realization of our Party's basic program and the execution of its basic line. Should we develop the national economy? Should we achieve 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 a task we should fulfill in order to realize the basic program of our Party. Although it is a magnificent task, it is not the basic task of the Party, still less the whole task of our Party. Originally the "four modernizations" were set forth as a plan in connection with

the task of developing the national economy. However, to pull off a monumental hoax, the "General Program" sets forth the realization of "four modernizations" as a major premise for all work both at present and in the next 25 years, a premise on which all of our work must be based. This fully shows that, in the eyes of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, at present, the only task is to undertake production and construction, there being no need for class struggle, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This then completely negates our Party's basic program and thoroughly tampers with the basic task and the orientation of advance for the whole Party and the people of the whole country.

After setting forth the major premise, a premise which requires no attention to be paid to class struggle and socialist revolution, the "General Program" then goes on the offensive, alleging that "taking the three directives as the key link" is the "general program for all work" not only at present but also in the future, including the next 25 years. Thus, it absurdly regards Chairman Mao's important instructions on such questions as the theory of proletarian dictatorship as something serving only the purpose of achieving the "four modernizations." This is an out-and-out distortion of Chairman Mao's instructions. Those who resort to eclecticism and sophistry are opposed to dialectics and pay no attention to dialectical logic, but that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" even make no reference to formal logic or reasoning. On the pretext that "a unified whole cannot be cut apart," he arbitrarily proposed "taking the three directives as the key link" and in no time turned it into a "general program for all work" of the whole Party and the whole country in the coming 25 years. Isn't that imposed on others? It is precisely by using this tactic that that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party negates class struggle as the key link, rejects the Party's basic line and concocts a revisionist program which is fundamentally antithetical to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and has nothing to do with Chairman Mao's instructions.

It is not accidental that the "General Program" begins and ends with calling for realization of "four modernizations." Here a question of utmost importance is raised, namely, what historical course China should take in the future, including the next 25 years? We believe that China is now in an important period of historical development: to adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, carry the socialist revolution through to the end, build a more prosperous great socialist country and gradually march toward communism, or to practice revisionism, restore the old order and take the beaten track of Soviet social-imperialism? The next several decades will certainly be a period marked

by a violent struggle between the two roads and two kinds of future. For the sake of the basic interests of the Chinese people and the people of the world, we must fight for the first kind of future and against the second. The Party's basic line is the only correct line for achieving this goal, a lifeline of the proletariat and the revolutionary people. That is why Chairman Mao has time and again pointed out: "**Never forget classes and class struggle**" and "**we must remind ourself of**" the Party's basic line "**every year, every month and every day.**" Since that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party substitutes "taking the three directives as the key link" for the Party's basic line and negates class struggle as the key link, he naturally wants to have the second kind of future and opposes the first. As a matter of fact, his so-called realization of "**four modernizations**" is nothing but a blueprint for all-round restoration of capitalism. Against this revisionist line our whole Party, whole army and the people of the whole country must of course wage a tit-for-tat struggle.

## II.

Does "taking the three directives as the key link" really include the study of the theory on proletarian dictatorship? It is entirely false and deceptive. People need only to take a look at how the "**General Program**" distorts and opposes Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of the theory of proletarian dictatorship to be able to understand the tricks played by the revisionists.

Toward the end of 1974, Chairman Mao issued an important instruction on the question of theory, pointing out: "**Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to make this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation.**" Speaking of the socialist system, Chairman Mao said: "**In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation she was more or less the same as a capitalist country. Even now she practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution to each according to his work and exchange through money, and in all this is scarcely different from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has been changed.**" Chairman Mao pointed out: "**Our country at present practices a commodity system; the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. Therefore, we should read more Marxist-Leninist works.**" The main feature of these instructions of Chairman Mao's is to emphasize the necessity and importance of

restricting bourgeois rights in combatting and preventing revisionism, further pointing out to us the orientation of continuing the revolution both in the superstructure and in the economic base under the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, what does the "General Program" say about the instruction on the question of theory? It completely casts aside the main theme of Chairman Mao's instruction, namely, the question of restricting bourgeois rights, and even does not say one word about it. The question of bourgeois rights being the soil and conditions engendering a new bourgeoisie, the question of revisionism as the main danger, the question of struggle between the two lines in the Party, and the question of dealing with capitalist roaders—all these disappear out of sight in the "General Program." This clearly shows that the so-called "taking the three directives as the key link" is solely aimed at twisting and abolishing Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, the theory of proletarian dictatorship.

Abolishing the actual content of the theory on proletarian dictatorship reveals the bourgeois nature of capitalist roaders. Chairman Mao, hitting the nail on the head, pointed out recently: "**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.**" This Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of Chairman Mao's profoundly points out the errors in line committed by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and the ideological origin and class root-causes of the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts stirred up by him. It is precisely because that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is afraid that the socialist revolution may cause him to come under fire, restrict the bourgeois rights they like and affect their bourgeois stand and world outlook that he cannot wait to dish up "taking the three directives as the key link," oppose taking class struggle as the key link, distort and tamper with Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, and advocate the theory of the dying out of class struggle in order to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party. Confronted with the Marxist revolutionary edge and afraid that their class would soon die out, those who hang up the signboard of "communists" but who actually represent the interests of the bourgeoisie always try by all possible means to distort and castrate the revolutionary content of Marxism, blunt its revolutionary edge, and make it suit the needs of the bourgeoisie. Is this not what that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" have

done?

Do things stop here? No. Those who reject taking class struggle as the key link and advocate the theory of the dying out of class struggle have always wanted to “put out” only the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and not the bourgeois offensives against the proletariat. The fact that while opposing class struggle, the “General Program” fiercely attacks the proletariat shows more than anything else this characteristic of class struggle.

Our Party’s basic theory and basic practice tell us: The principal contradiction throughout the historical period of socialism is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the main danger is revisionism, the subject of revolution is the bourgeoisie, and the target is persons in power in the Party taking the capitalist road. But what does the “General Program” say about this? Hoisting the banner of opposing the ultra-“Left,” it says that the main problem at present is that some “class enemies who oppose Marxism inherit the mantle from Lin Piao, always take over our revolutionary slogans and then distort and emasculate them,” that they “throw the good cadres of the Party and advanced model personalities off the stage.” It even alleges that “this struggle is the concentrated expression of the present struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines.”

The “General Program” here uses the term “class enemies who oppose Marxism,” but deliberately covers up its class content. To whom does it allude? The capitalist roaders in the Party? No. Not only is the “General Program” as silent about the concept of capitalist roaders in the Party as Ah Q is about the scabs on his head, but it also forbids others to refer to it. Does it allude to landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, and old and new bourgeois elements? No, either. Because the “General Program” explains clearly that these people are not included in the concept “class enemies who oppose Marxism.” In fact, judging by the fact that they regard persisting in class struggle as the key link as going against “taking the three directives as the key,” this “unified whole which cannot be cut apart,” “class enemies” who “emasculate revolutionary slogans” are those Chinese Communists who adhere to Chairman Mao’s proletarian revolutionary line, 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 proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie as “class enemies.” They do so both in writing and in practice. They describe Lin Piao’s ultra-Right revisionist line as ultra-“Left.” In this way, they can use such phrases as “inheriting Lin Piao’s mantle” to attack all revolutionary people who criticize revisionism, i.e., Right opportunism, denounce the Great Proletarian

Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, and take the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao as treasure. The so-called “inheriting Lin Piao’s mantle” (and not a bit inheriting Liu Shao-chi’s mantle!) and “taking over our revolutionary slogans, distorting and emasculating them”—this Hu Feng-type rhetoric can be appreciated by the new landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, old and new bourgeois elements, by unrepentant capitalist roaders and people who want to reverse the verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and settle scores with it. It delights them because these are the words in their hearts they want to express.

The “General Program” also attacks class struggle and the struggle between the two lines, alleging that they “throw our Party’s fine cadres and advanced model personalities off the stage.” This is sheer fabrication and slander. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party once said: “Proper policies must be implemented for old workers and experienced cadres because once a movement starts it often hurts them.” Those words said in the “General Program” are copied from here. The phrase “once a movement starts” applies to all the important line struggles waged by our Party in the past, and all these struggles are totally negated. It may be asked: Is it true that from criticizing Chen Tu-hsiu, Li Li-san, Chu Chiu-pai, Lo Chang-lung, Wang Ming and Chang Kuo-tao to criticizing Kao Kang, Peng Te-hua, Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, “once a movement starts,” all experienced cadres and old workers were “hurt.” Did they all “throw the Party’s fine cadres and advanced model personalities off the stage”? Is this not a distortion of and slander against the series of political movements carried out by our Party under Chairman Mao’s leadership, including the Great 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: “Once the movement starts,” it is bound to “hurt” people. But people it “often hurts” are not experienced old cadres and workers, but those “old” chieftains of the revisionist line and the erroneous line they push. If we did not wage struggle against their erroneous line, our Party would not have developed nor led the people of the whole nation to triumphantly enter the socialist revolution from the democratic revolution, and we would not have been able to continue our advance toward communism. It is precisely because “once a movement starts” it will “hurt” the revisionist line that the unrepentant capitalist roaders in the Party feel sad about this and want to reverse the verdicts and re-write our Party’s history. However, this can only be sheer wishful thinking!

That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party frantically tries to

reverse the verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and settle scores with it, and to carry out restorationist activities in all spheres by his "taking the three directives as the key link." He repeatedly clamors for "readjustment." How to "readjust"? The "General Program" says clearly: It is necessary to "readjust work in all fields" by "taking the three directives as the key link." "Readjustment is needed in industry, agriculture, communications and transport, finance and trade, science and technology, culture, education and health, literature and art, the army and also the Party." My goodness, nine major "readjustments"! From the economic base to the superstructure, from within the Party to outside it, from the localities to the center, everything is bad and must be "readjusted," and not a bit or drop should be allowed to escape from the net. We also say that certain work in certain fields should be readjusted, but that is aimed at further implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, principles and policies, and at doing our work better. What, then, is the all-inclusive "readjustment" which that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party wants to carry out? 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 health, we have seen very clearly that he wants to use "readjustment" to reverse the verdicts of the Cultural Revolution and 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 wants to launch an all-out counter-attack in revenge, that is, to restore capitalism in an all-round way.

If, as the "General Program" says, some people "practice revisionism by hoisting the banner of anti-revisionism and carry out restoration by hoisting the banner of anti-restoration," that is no more than a self-portrait of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and of his "General Program" of "taking the three directives as the key link."

### III.

On the question of relationship between politics and economics and between revolution and production, the "General Program" also grossly distorts and tampers with Chairman Mao's instructions. Making no mention of class struggle and socialist revolution in the economic sphere, it draws the development of the national economy into the orbit of the revisionist theory of productive forces.

As we all know, although the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of the means of production has been in the main completed in our country it has not been fully finished. Even in those sec-

tors where socialist transformation has been carried out, a fierce struggle between transformation and anti-transformation and between restoration and anti-restoration is still present. In respect to relations between men and distribution, there is still the question of continuing to deepen the socialist revolution. Therefore, while carrying out socialist construction, we must strive to solve various problems in the relations of production and do a good job of revolution in the superstructure. This means that we must grasp class struggle as the key link, grasp revolution and promote production. Because it is opposed to the correct policy of "**grasping revolution and promoting production**," the "General Program" goes all out to attack the Great Cultural Revolution by saying that since it was started, "attention has been paid only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production. Anyone who mentions the need to grasp production and do a good job of economic construction would be accused of promoting 'the theory of productive forces' and practicing revisionism." Such an attack precisely exposes the reactionary stand of the "General Program" in upholding the revisionist theory of productive forces.

Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution began, the revolutionary masses have applied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to revolutionary mass criticism of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, including the criticism of the theory of productive forces peddled by them. Such mass criticism is a class struggle waged by the proletariat to smash capitalist restoration. This is what the "General Program" slanders as "attention has been paid only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production." However, many living facts show that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a strong motive force in the development of China's productive forces. Mass criticism of the revisionist line and the theory of productive forces has promoted the substantial development of socialist production and produced solid fruits. Is it right for the masses of people to label Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and their like as "revisionists" and "promoters of the theory of productive forces"? Absolutely right! These two labels are quite appropriate and should not be removed! Lenin said it well: "**The negation of revisionism is aimed at covering up one's own revisionism.**" The negation of the criticism of the revisionist theory of productive forces by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and by his "General Program" is aimed at inheriting the mantle of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, at continuing to push the counter-revolutionary revisionist line and theory of productive forces.

To say that we pay "attention only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production" is nothing but to confuse black and white and right and wrong. It may be asked: When the eight

hundred million people, by relying on their own efforts, grow their own food and make their own clothing and establish an independent national economic system on the basis of self-reliance, and when they have smashed the economic blockades and blackmail by imperialism and social-imperialism, do they "not pay attention to economics" and "not pay attention to production"? Eating the food grown by the masses of people, wearing the clothes made by the masses of people and living in the houses built by the masses of people and yet uttering such nonsense as "paying no attention to economics and production"—this is virtually a shameless vilification against our Party and the vast masses and cadres battling at the frontline of industrial and agricultural production for a long time!

The difference between Marxism and the revisionist theory of productive forces is not on the question of whether or not 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, but it has also held all along that the development of productive forces cannot be separated from the reform of the relations of production and the superstructure, and that only by grasping revolution will it be possible to promote production. And the adjustment in the relations of production 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 and man's enthusiasm for socialism is fully aroused under socialist conditions, production will flourish at a swift tempo. But the theory of productive forces does away with class struggle and the socialist revolution in the superstructure and the relations of production. It regards the development of production as the only decisive thing. Such is the crux of the matter. If we, as that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party advocates, devote ourselves only to production and construction without paying attention to class struggle and revolution and let revisionism prevail and capitalism be restored, then the developed economy, production and "four modernizations" will become material forces oppressing and enslaving the proletariat and the working people. Therefore, after the victory of 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 this basic issue—overthrow the bourgeoisie, establish the proletarian political power, and eliminate all possibilities of capitalist restoration.**"

When that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" so energetically attack others for "paying no attention to economics" and "paying no attention to production," is he really interested in socialist production? No! His only interest is in

capitalist production, in undermining the socialist relations of production and the productive forces. In his eyes, “do a good job in production” is actually intended to restore what belongs to capitalism. This is clearly disclosed in the section of the “General Program” on enterprise management. The “General Program” says: Following the development of production and technology, “rules and regulations will become increasingly strict, demanding that people strictly abide by these rules and regulations.” “This is so not only in capitalist society but in socialist society as well, and will be so in the future communist society.” These views totally negate the class nature of rules and regulations and ignore the essential difference between socialism and communism, and capitalism. As we know, rules and regulations reflect human relations in production, and have a clear-cut class nature. Rules and regulations of economic sectors in capitalist society oppress and fleece the working class and the laboring people. We are a socialist country, whose masters are the working class and laboring people. We are in favor of relying on the working class and the laboring people in setting up rules and regulations suited to the development of socialist economy. We oppose anarchy, and also object to “Control, restriction and repression” of the workers and laboring people by exercising bourgeois dictatorship. The “Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company,” personally approved by Chairman Mao, embodies the basic principles that should be followed by the rules and regulations of socialist enterprises. Yet the “General Program” says nothing about this but, instead, cries for the need to set up “increasingly strict” rules and regulations. The rules and regulations in the economic sectors of capitalism are indeed very strict and rigorous. The time workers spend in the toilet also has to be taken into account, and they will be punished in various ways if they exceed the time-limit allowed. But the “General Program” looks upon such rules and regulations as above-class, above-time things, claiming that this is so not only in capitalist society but also in socialist and communist societies. If this is not a call for restoring capitalism, what is it? If it is not a call for a dictatorship over the working class and the laboring people, what is it? If we link this to other words and deeds of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, we can see even more clearly that the reason why he proposes “taking the three directives as the key link” and regards development of the national economy also a “key link” is that he wants to implement his revisionist line of “disregarding the distinction between the white cat and the black cat” and disregarding the difference between imperialism and Marxism, a line which actually wants capitalism and not socialism.

## IV.

“Taking the three directives as the key link” is couched in Marxist phrases and concocted by an eclectical sleight of hand. It is a hypocritical and reactionary revisionist program. The “General Program,” as a means of publicizing “taking the three directives as the key link,” also reflects this characteristic. It is a big hodgepodge which is very poor theoretically, very bad in tactics, fragmentary, confusing in logic and contradictory in ideology. But it helps us further understand and criticize the reactionary essence of “taking the three directives as the key link.” On this point, it is valuable teaching material by negative example.

To criticize in depth “taking the three directives as the key link” is of tremendous significance to us in upholding Marxism, and combatting revisionism, sticking to 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 to practice Marxism or revisionism, including the question of whether to keep to or oppose the theoretical basis of a proletarian political party. The teachers of proletarian revolution have always attached major importance to the principled nature and purity of the proletarian political program, always adopted a clear-cut stand in uncompromising struggles against all kinds of opportunist and revisionist programs, deeply and thoroughly criticized them politically and ideologically, and pointed out the correct direction for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. When criticizing *The Gotha Program*, 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.”** The moment the opportunist Duhring emerged to oppose the Party’s theoretical basis, Engels intended to criticize him, and with Marx’s support, he determinedly **“put everything aside to deal with this nuisance—Duhring.”**

On the question regarding the theoretical basis of Marxism, we must adopt a serious, militant attitude. This is because the mistaken views or slogans on the question of theoretical basis will often lead to thoroughly betraying Marxism, to the evil path of revisionism. When Khrushchev put forward the revisionist line of “peaceful transition,” Chairman Mao sharply pointed out: **“Is the October Revolution still good? Can it still be taken as a model for all other countries? Khrushchev’s report delivered at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party said that political power could be seized through the parliamentary road. This means that other countries need not learn from the October Revolution. Once this door is open, Leninism will be**

**basically cast away.**" When Liu Shao-chi advanced the so-called "contradiction between the four-cleans and the four-uncleans" during the socialist education movement, Chairman Mao realized that this was an attempt to reject the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the principal contradiction and to ignore the principled question that classes, class contradictions and class struggle still exist in socialist society. He pointed out: "**If we forget this basic theory and practice of our Party in the past dozen years, we will go astray.**" When Lin Piao dished up his revisionist theoretical program of the "theory of innate geniis," Chairman Mao promptly exposed its reactionary nature. He pointed out: the question of whether "**history is made by heroes or by slaves,**" whether man's knowledge (and ability which also falls into the category of knowledge) is innate or acquired after birth, and whether we should keep to the idealist theory of transcendentalism or the materialist theory of reflection, is a major question of right and wrong concerning two classes, two lines and two kinds of world outlook. He called on the whole Party to take the Marxist stand and draw a clear demarcation line with Lin Piao's revisionism. Today, when that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party proposes "taking the three directives as the key link," it is likewise not a simple question of formulation, but a question involving whether we can uphold our Party's basic program and basic line and whether we should consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat or restore capitalism. If we are to uphold Marxism and defend the theoretical basis of the proletarian party and 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 of reversing verdicts and the thorough criticism of "taking the three directives as the key link," our Party and the revolutionary cause of the proletariat will certainly advance still more rapidly and win still greater victories.