



Plenum Report Opens Way for More Effective Work

(Contributed) Page 3

Revolutionary Activity (Contributed) Page 5

Uphold the Theoretical Weapon of Proletarian

Dictatorship Lu Ming (Peking Review, No. 13, 1975) Page 7



Plenum Report Opens Way for More Effective Work

(Contributed)

THE RECENT Plenum held under the leadership of the Political Committee has raised the perspective of strengthening the work of the whole Party. In an all-round way the PC has placed before the Party the necessity for grasping the vital link in the up-building of the Party. This link, the strengthening of the leadership at all levels — branch through to national with priority to the building of a strong central leadership — reflects the objective and subjective factors and the integration of theory with practice. It also reflects a firm grasp of the two-line struggle in such a way that the positive side will be promoted and the negative side overcome.

By emphasising the need to build a strong centre and leadership at all levels, the Plenum conforms not only to objective laws of development of the Party but also to the principle of democratic centralism.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

It might appear that with the emphasis on a strong centre, on strong leadership at all levels and on centralism, that the rights and participation of members in the activity of the Party, is being neglected, overlooked or opposed. On the contrary.

The basic organisational principle of the Party, democratic centralism, requires the practice of both centralism and democracy. The strengthening of centralism is a condition for the strengthening of democracy. This democracy involves the fullest and lively participation of the membership in activity, in decision-making, in examination of party practice and in the checking up on the carrying out of decisions and the work of higher committees.

But this democracy should have no local, parochial boundaries nor should it claim special rights for its local members in opposition to or at the expense of the centre.

A slogan which undermines the organisation is thoroughly incorrect. The McAra line of "No Strong Branches, No Strong Party," by exaggerating the role of the branch at the expense of the centre, actually reduced the democratic rights of members.

How can the noble aspiration of working for a socialist New Zealand and for a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist Party which is an essential prerequisite for the achievement of such an aspiration, be translated into effective action if the Party branches are encouraged to do "their own thing", the centre is isolated and possibilities of co-ordinating work, frustrated? This is not democracy but ultra-

democracy and opportunism which would, if permitted, lead inevitably to revisionism and the demise of a revolutionary party and hence the defeat for the socialist objective.

We accept the fact that a highly disciplined party is a vital necessity. What is the nature of the Party's discipline? This is a voluntary type discipline which does not mature and develop on the basis of submerging the individual, suppressing his initiative or relying on blind obedience like some religious order. On the contrary, it flourishes because the principle of democracy under centralised leadership, when given every care, ensures the earnest, lively and active participation by members in the making of decisions and in the carrying out of these decisions both on a local and a national scale.

CONSCIOUS DISCIPLINE

The conscious discipline of members is again greatly strengthened by the practice of leading committees seeking opinions from members inviting examination of their work and assisting members to defeat revisionist attempts to undermine the Party organisationally and in the field of ideology.

Consequently the emphasis in the Plenum report on strengthening leadership at all levels may appear to some to one-sidedly emphasise centralism to the detriment of democracy. But this is just not so.

By strengthening leadership at all levels, the condition is being established for activity of members to be more purposeful, more effective and more productive. Actually the membership is being encouraged to fully participate. Stronger leadership at all levels is for the purpose not of reducing members' rights and involvement but for increasing them, heightening members' sense of responsibility to their class and to their party.

Only a truly democratic organisation could raise such an opportunity before its membership. Only a leadership deeply conscious of the role, vitality and purpose of their members, can come forward as our Political Committee has done.

This line is in sharp contrast to the way that the leading committees and personalities of the parliamentary parties behave. There the members are feared and steps taken to undermine or circumvent their decisions. The parliamentary Labour Party performance is notorious for ignoring Labour Party conference decisions.

Strong branches are not enough. The activity of all branches requires a co-ordinating centre. Because this single centre has greater and more varied responsibilities, because it is charged with implementing the line of the party it needs more concern, attention and solicitude than all other levels of leadership.

Because the attitude to the centre is a question of principle,

it is a test of whether or not one is truly a revolutionary.

The line that opposes a strong single centre is the line of many centres, the line of independence for branches and districts and the line of isolating the centre. This is the bourgeois line. Such a line and tendencies which consciously or unconsciously help it should be examined, judged and criticised.

Organisational measures alone will not solve the problem of incorrect practice. The ideology behind it should be examined and corrected.

The essence of the line of strengthening leadership at all levels, and in the first place a strong centre, is a method to make party democracy more effective, to raise higher the responsibilities of party members in party building. But party democracy cannot be made more effective unless it is under the centralised leadership of a centre. This is the thoroughly correct and principled stand of the Political Committee acting in conformity with international experience and the concrete conditions of New Zealand. When fully studied and implemented it is bound to have good results.

Revolutionary Activity

(Contributed)

WHAT is revolutionary work and activity? During the past several years during which demonstrations on the Viet Nam and other issues were of frequent occurrence and for which there was mass interest and support, it became apparent that some people did not understand — or weren't interested in understanding — the true nature of revolutionary work and activity. They made the mistake of thinking that the picket, the march or the slogan on its placard was the most important revolutionary activity, or the only worthwhile one, rather than one of the many ways of engaging in political work.

No revolutionary would disparage or under-rate the value and significance of those demonstrations or the people, particularly the youth — once described by an Opposition National Party spokesman as "those scruffy-looking protestors" — who participated in them. Without question, those demonstrations — the open mass struggle on the streets — played a vital part in arousing opposition to the criminal war in Viet Nam, waged by US imperialism and its satellites and in exposing imperialism as the enemy of

the people.

But it is important to understand that much of the hardest work was done by people, quietly and without fuss, acknowledgement or publicity. It was such unspectacular work, especially in the early period which ensured broad support for mass action at a later stage. Their methods consisted of grass-roots activity at the work-place, writing, pamphleteering, giving talks, attending meetings, door-knocking and studying Marxist-Leninist theory. It is indeed, hard to measure the effect of this most important work.

But there were some people who were not to be found for these necessary tasks.

In some fields there was certainly action of a kind. In a period of heightened political action, there were those who were more concerned with efforts on a reformist plane. And at this time anarchists, Trotskyists and revisionists were prominent, ever ready to expound their diversionary policies or lines at meetings and on the speaker's stand.

But in the arduous struggle to prepare the ground, to formulate a correct line of march, to raise the level of consciousness on the nature of imperialism, such elements were absent.

On the question of the role of "pseudo-revolutionaries" Lenin had this to say: "It is not difficult to be a revolutionary, when the revolution has already flared up and is at its height, when everybody is joining the revolution just because they are carried away because it is the fashion, and sometimes even from careerist motives. After its victory, the proletariat has to make the most strenuous efforts, to suffer the pains of martyrdom, one might say, to "liberate" itself from such pseudo-revolutionaries. It is far more difficult — and far more useful — to be a revolutionary when the conditions for direct, open really mass and really revolutionary struggle **do not yet exist**, to defend the interests of the revolution (by propaganda, agitation and organisation) in non-revolutionary bodies and often even in downright reactionary bodies, in non-revolutionary circumstances, among masses who are incapable of immediately appreciating the need for revolutionary methods of action." ("Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder).

Pseudo-revolutionaries of a similar type are still around to plague the revolutionary movement today. They often bring unnecessary and unjustified criticism on self-sacrificing people who display sincerity, discipline and honesty in their various activist roles.

The revolution will not be won nor will it be led, by revolutionaries who ride on the crest of the wave but shy off when the going is hard.

Only true Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries are capable of leading and developing the struggle of the working class and the broad masses of the people for their freedom and independence and for socialism.

Uphold the Theoretical Weapon of Proletarian Dictatorship

Commemorating the centenary of the writing of "Critique of the Gotha Programme"

—Lu Ming ("Peking Review" No. 13, 1975)

IT IS EXACTLY a century this year since the great teacher Marx wrote in 1875 his brilliant work "Critique of the Gotha Programme" in his tit-for-tat struggle against Lasalle's opportunism. In the period of some 15 years between completion of this work in 1875 and its first publication in 1891, there were serious struggles against opportunists. Applying in this work the most thorough, complete and comprehensive theory of development which is richest in content, that is, materialist dialectics. Marx examined the question of the imminent collapse of capitalism and the question of the future development of communism, expounded the differences between the lower and higher stages of communist society and unfolded the splendid prospects of the higher stage of communist society. Marx emphatically pointed out that in the transformation from capitalist society to communist society there must be a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the dictatorship of the proletariat. For a century this programmatic work of scientific communism has always led and inspired the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and hundreds of millions of people all over the world.

Earth-shaking changes have taken place throughout the world in the last 100 years. Forty-two years after the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" was written, the Russian proletariat, under the leadership of the great Lenin, won victory in the October Socialist Revolution through armed uprising and ushered in the new era of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the world. Thirty-two years after the October Revolution, the Chinese people, under the leadership of our great leader Chairman Mao and after protracted revolutionary war, overthrew the reactionary rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, founded the People's Republic of China and established the dictatorship of the proletariat in China. Today the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the oppressed nations and people throughout the world are surging forward, shaking the entire moribund capitalist world and continuously winning new victories. Although the revolutionary road is tortuous and capitalism has been restored in the Soviet

Union, the homeland of the October Revolution, because the Khrushchev and Brezhnev renegade clique has usurped supreme power in the Party and state, this is but a brief interlude in the whole course of historical development. **The world is progressing, the future is bright and no one can change this general trend of history.** (Mao Tsetung: "On the Changking Negotiations".) More than once the practice of the international communist movement in the last 100 years has proved that the theories of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat expounded in the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" are irrefutable truths. Having gone through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticise Lin Piao and Confucius, we have gained a deeper understanding of this point after restudying this work in the light of reality.

RECORD OF STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

In the history of the international communist movement, the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" is a brilliant record of the struggle waged by Marxism against revisionism. In the 1870s the centre of the international workers' movement moved from France to Germany and the German workers' movement was developing vigorously. After the struggle against Lassalleism and directly educated and helped by Marx and Engels, the German proletariat at that time founded its independent political party — the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party or the Eisenachers. Although the programme of this party did not completely discard the influence of Lasalle's opportunism, it kept, generally speaking, the spirit required in the general rules of the First International and basically followed Marx's revolutionary line. It was therefore supported by a growing number of workers. The Lassalleans, who were opposed to the Eisenachers and had once been very powerful, carried out an opportunist line and went all the way to meet the needs of the landlord and capitalist classes; they therefore steadily lost the support of the masses and ended up in extreme isolation. Under these circumstances the Lassalleans in 1874 reversed their previous stand of refusing to become allied with the Eisenachers and eagerly sought a merger with them in a vain attempt to save their own tottering status.

Faced with this situation, Marx and Engels who always set great store by the solidarity and unity in the German workers' movement considered that there could be an alliance, but they repeatedly warned the leaders of the Eisenachers that there should be no bargaining about principles on the question of organisational unity. In a letter in March 1875 to August Bebel, Engels specially emphasised that there should be absolutely no concession to the Lassalleans in the theoretical sphere, which is of decisive importance for the programme, and that **"the first condition of union was that they should cease to be sectarians, Lassalleans."** But Liebknecht and

others who were passionately seeking the merger ignored the advice of Marx and Engels and went their own way. They sacrificed principles and joined the Lassalleans in concocting a draft programme which deviated from the theories of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and was permeated with Lassalle's opportunist viewpoints. This draft was known as the Gotha Programme when it was later adopted at the congress that united the two groups. To express his attitude in principle towards this programme and prevent it from exerting a bad influence on the international workers' movement, Marx severely criticised the draft programme, article by article and sentence by sentence, before the unity congress and wrote "Marginal Notes to the Programme of the German Workers' Party," that is, the "Critique of the Gotha Programme."

GOTHA PROGRAMME'S ESSENTIAL PARTS

Marx pointed out that the Gotha Programme was a "**thoroughly objectionable programme that demoralises the Party.**" Its essential parts were the acceptance of the Lassalleans' view of realising socialism by relying on "state aid" and liquidation of proletarian revolution, as well as the acceptance of the Lassalleans' stand of founding a "free state" through efforts to win universal suffrage and liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Gotha Programme came out soon after the Paris Commune revolution in 1871. At that time Marx and Engels already had summed up the experience of the Paris Commune and put forward to the proletariat the world over the task of smashing and breaking the existing state machinery of the bourgeoisie and establishing proletarian state power after the Paris Commune. However, ignoring this important experience, Liebknecht and others even retreated to Lassalleanism by "**accepting all the essential Lassallean economic phrases and demands**" and Lassalle's nonsensical opinions. "**The Eisenachers actually became Lassalleans**", at least according to the programme.

The Lassalleans were pseudo-socialists and essentially bourgeois socialists. They **intended, under the pretext of reorganising society to preserve the foundations of existing society and hence the society.** (Engels: "Principles of Communism".) This is clearly revealed by Lassalle's dogmas stuffed into the Gotha Programme.

From the very beginning the programme avoided mentioning ownership of the means of production and babbled about labour being the source of all wealth. This was one of Lassalle's dogmas. Marx pointed out: Labour is not the source of all wealth and nature is just as much the source of wealth as labour. This is because the production of material wealth not only needs human labour but also subjects and instruments of labour. The popular saying that "labour creates the world" precisely takes these conditions as its

prerequisite. Labour does not have supernatural creative power. Only in so far as a worker **“from the beginning behaves towards nature, the primary source of all instruments and subjects of labour, as an owner”** can he create wealth. In capitalist society, why must the workers sell their labour power to the capitalists and become the latter's wage-slaves? This is precisely because the means of production are in the hands of the capitalists and the working class has nothing but its own labour power. The programme engaged in empty talk about “labour,” but avoided mentioning a point of basic importance — to whom did the means of production belong — and thereby covered up the relations of exploitation under capitalism and the root cause of exploitation and oppression suffered by the proletariat. Such a fallacy is out-and-out bourgeois stuff. After Khrushchev and Brezhnev came to power, socialist ownership by the whole people in the Soviet Union has degenerated into ownership by the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class. Picking up Lassalle's long bankrupt fallacy, Brezhnev and his like also shout that “labour is the source of wealth” and demand that the Soviet people “work, work and work again.” Their aim is nothing but to cover up the fact of capitalist restoration and the relations of capitalist exploitation, so as to squeeze more profits from the workers. This straw, however, cannot save the capitalist system and the Soviet revisionist renegade clique from their fate of destruction.

One **“outrageous step backwards”** in the Gotha Programme was to impose Lassalle's “iron law of wages” on the German party and attribute the fight against capitalism to the “abolition of the wage system together with the iron law of wages.” The so-called “iron law of wages” is garbage Lassalle picked up from the bourgeois economists and all it says is that wages can only remain at the lowest level of living needed by the workers to maintain their existence and propagate offspring. If wages remain higher than this level for a long time and the workers' living is improved, this will stimulate population growth and supply will exceed demand in the labour market. Consequently, wages will be forced to fall to the original level. That is to say, the poverty of the working class is determined by the natural law of population growth and any revolution waged by the working class cannot help improve this state of affairs. This kind of bourgeois theory has been thoroughly refuted in Marx's “Capital.” The root cause of the exploitation and enslavement of the working class, Marx pointed out, is the wage-labour system based on capitalist private ownership. The working class can extricate itself from poverty and enslavement only through violent revolution and through abolition of the wage-labour system. Once the wage-labour system is abolished, its law will naturally cease to exist. Precisely as Marx pointed out: **“If I abolish wage labour, then naturally I abolish its laws also, whether they are of “iron” or sponge.”** However, the draft programme evaded mention of the

abolition of the wage-labour system but went round and round this so-called "iron law." This is tantamount to asking the working class to give up revolution and wait for "state aid" to realise the Lassalle-type of socialism. The "iron law of wages" is based on the notorious Malthusian theory of population. With this reactionary viewpoint as the basis, one can only reach the conclusion of abolishing all revolutions. The reason is that **"if this theory is correct, then again I cannot abolish the law even if I abolish wage labour a hundred times over, because the law then governs not only the system of wage labour but every social system."**

The Gotha Programme also trumpeted so-called "fair distribution", "equal right", "undiminished proceeds of labour" and other Lassalle dogmas, and repeated the theory that "distribution decides production" in bourgeois economics. Marxism holds that the mode of distribution is decided by the mode of production. Only by abolishing capitalist private ownership can the capitalist relations of distribution be changed. The elimination of the private ownership of the means of production **"can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."** ("Manifesto of the Communist Party"). Lenin stressed that the bourgeois state **"cannot be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through the process of 'withering away,' but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution."** ("The State and Revolution"). Chairman Mao has summed up this basic principle in a simple formula, **"Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."** ("Problems of War and Strategy."). Historical experience has proved that this is a truth and the only road for the proletariat to gain liberation. From Lassalle's "state aid" to "peaceful transition" advocated by old and new revisionists, they all betray this principle. Their fallacies are nothing but spiritual weapons for upholding the capitalist system and opposing proletarian revolution.

Striving for a "free state," as the Gotha Programme called for, is the political programme of Lassalle's opportunism. Marxism considers that the state is the product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms and the instrument by which one class oppresses another. After seizing political power, the proletariat will establish a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which aims not at bringing about "freedom" above classes but suppressing the resistance of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. Flaunting the banner of "free state", Lassalle and his followers put forward a series of such bourgeois democratic demands as striving for universal suffrage. Their aim was to uphold the combined dictatorship of the big landlord and big capitalist classes.

SOCIALISM CAN BE NOTHING BUT THE REVOLUTIONARY DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

In criticising the reactionary essence of Lassalle's "free state,"

Marx also pointed out: **"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."** This scientific conclusion by Marx was an important development of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat after the publication of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party."

From capitalist to communist society there must be a period of revolutionary transformation, and this is decided by the special features and historical tasks of the proletarian revolution. This revolution is the most deep-going and thorough revolution in human history and is fundamentally different from previous revolutions. For instance, the bourgeois revolution involves the replacement of one private ownership by another and of one kind of relations of exploitation by another, and capitalist relations of production may emerge within feudal society and develop over a long period of time. But this is not the case with the proletarian revolution, for socialist relations of production cannot possibly emerge within capitalist society. Only after the proletariat has seized political power through violent revolution can it establish socialist ownership of the means of production. Moreover, after the basic completion of the Socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, it is still necessary to carry out continuously a thorough socialist revolution on the economic front and particularly on the political and ideological fronts. Therefore, the seizure of political power by the proletariat is only the beginning of the socialist revolution.

Socialist society is the elementary stage of communist society and it just **"emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges."** To eliminate these birth marks of the old society and move to the higher stage of communism needs a considerably long historical period. In socialist society the means of production have been transformed from the private property of individuals into common property. To this extent bourgeois right has disappeared. But it still exists in other aspects. For example, the principle of to each according to his work **"is still — in principle — bourgeois right."** Here, everyone who contributes the same amount of social labour may get back the same amount of social products. But because individual labour power may be strong or weak and the number of children one has varies, therefore the degree of well-being differs from person to person. This difference constitutes an inequality. At the same time, the differences left behind from the old society between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual labour still exist. The exploiting-class ideology and the old force of habit still cannot be eliminated at

one swoop. During this period of revolutionary transformation, not only do the overthrown exploiting classes attempt a restoration and the spontaneous forces of the petty bourgeoisie may engender new bourgeois elements, but as a result of the influence and corruption by the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois spontaneous forces, degenerates and new bourgeois elements — agents of the bourgeoisie — may also emerge from within the ranks of the working class and among personnel of Party and state organs. Chairman Mao recently pointed out: **“Lenin said that ‘small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale.’ They are also engendered among a part of the working class and of the Party membership. Both within the ranks of the proletariat and among the personnel of state and other organs there are people who take to the bourgeois-style of life.”** As long as imperialism and social-imperialism exist in the world, the activities of domestic reactionaries always echo the activities of the international reactionaries to subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat. All this shows that in the whole period of socialism, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is protracted, tortuous and at times very sharp. In order to smash the resistance of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, prevent capitalist restoration, eliminate classes, restrict bourgeois right and finally eliminate it after a considerably long period of time and realise communism, there must be a transition period politically in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has to be consistently upheld. Marx pointed out: **“This Socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social relations.”** (“The Class Struggles in France,” 1848-1850).

The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the quintessence of Marxism. Throughout the historical period of socialism, upholding or opposing the proletarian dictatorship is the touchstone for testing genuine or false Marxism. Lenin pointed out that the recognition of class struggle alone is insufficient and only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is also insufficient to recognise alone the overthrow of bourgeois rule, the expropriation of the expropriators and the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat. **“The essence of Marx’s teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a single class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire historical period which separates capital-**

ism from "classless society", from Communism." (Lenin: "The State and Revolution.") The Gotha Programme said nothing about the dictatorship of the proletariat, but called for striving to build a "free state" by legal means. This fully reveals its essence of opportunism. Inheriting Lassalle's mantle, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, concocted the fallacy of the "state of the whole people," shouting that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary before the withering away of the state." This precisely proves that they are the sworn enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

HISTORICAL PERIOD OF SOCIALISM

In the struggle against modern revisionism and against opportunism in the Party, our great leader Chairman Mao has comprehensively summed up both the positive and negative historical experience in the international communist movement and developed the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Chairman Mao has profoundly analysed the law of struggle between the two classes and between the two roads after the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, put forward the great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and formulated the Party's basic line in the whole historical period of socialism.

Chairman Mao clearly pointed out: "Socialist society covers a considerably 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 recognise 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."

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution personally initiated and led by Chairman Mao has further solved, in theory and practice, the most important current topic of how to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent capitalist restoration under the conditions of socialism. The movement to criticise Lin Biao and Confucius, which is now developing in a broad, deep-going and persevering way, is a political and ideological struggle in the superstructure in which the proletariat triumphs over the bourgeoisie and socialism over capitalism. This movement also aims at consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, preventing capitalist restoration

and persevering in the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Recently, Chairman Mao again issued an important instruction on the question of theory. Chairman Mao pointed out: "Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to get this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation." He also pointed out at the same time: "Our country at present practises a commodity system, the wage system is unequal too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. Such things have to be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. For these reasons if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system." This extremely important instruction of Chairman Mao's expounds in theory the historical tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat and profoundly analyses the social basis engendering the revisionist line. It is of great practical and far-reaching historical significance to us in further implementing the Party's basic line, consolidating and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, persisting in the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and doing a good job in the struggle of combatting and preventing revisionism.

Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao were both renegades who had betrayed the dictatorship of the proletariat. They denied that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between socialism and capitalism is the principal contradiction in socialist society; they also denied that the proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure, including all spheres of culture, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat should impose necessary restrictions on the remaining part of bourgeois right. Lin Piao attempted to change fundamentally the Party's basic line and subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism, and following in the steps of Confucius, he dished up the reactionary programme of "restraining oneself and returning to the rites." By attacking Chin Shih Huang, the first emperor of the Chin Dynasty, he made venomous attacks on the dictatorship of the proletariat and clamoured for founding a "genuine socialist" state implementing a "benevolent policy." His so-called "genuine socialist" state was the same trash as the "free state" of Lassalle, ringleader of the old opportunism, and the "state of the whole people" of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique. What Lin Piao meant in fact was that he wanted the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists and his gang of new bourgeois elements to come to power so that he could found a fascist Lin dynasty.

The focus of contention between the Marxist line and Lassalle's opportunist line in the German party was whether to uphold the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat or to liquidate them. Our struggle against the two anti-Party cliques of Liu

Shao-chi and Lin Piao also was waged around the question of adhering to or opposing the Party's basic line and consolidating or subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat. This kind of struggle will still continue in the future. Therefore, it is a long-term task to earnestly study the basic Marxist theories on class struggle, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. All opportunists are accustomed to creating confusion in theory. In his demagogic pamphlets, Lassalle mixed the correct things he got from Marx with his own incorrect things so as to confuse people. Swindlers like Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao also used the same trick. An important reason leading Liebkecht to commit mistakes on matters of principle was that **"he has always been confused theoretically"** and was unable to draw a clear line of demarcation between Marxism and Lassalle's opportunism. This lesson merits our serious consideration. Theory is the basis of line. **"There can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory."** (Lenin: "Our Programme.") To be a conscious proletarian revolutionary, one must earnestly study works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and by Chairman Mao, master the Marxist stand, viewpoint and method, and combine study with criticism and temper oneself and raise one's political level in the struggle of criticising the bourgeoisie and revisionism.

(Slightly abridged — Ed.; "C.R.")

Published 3/12/75. Registered at the G.P.O., Wellington, as a Magazine.

Published by the In Print Publishing Co. Ltd., 139 Albert St., Auckland;
and printed by Wilson Printery Ltd., 139 Albert St., Auckland.