



**THE STRUGGLE
BETWEEN
THE TWO ROADS
IN CHINA'S
COUNTRYSIDE**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE TWO ROADS IN CHINA'S COUNTRYSIDE

by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao*,
Hongqi and *Jiefangjun Bao*

(November 23, 1967)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1968

Quotation from Chairman Mao Tse-tung

If socialism does not occupy the rural front, capitalism assuredly will. Is it possible to take a road which is neither capitalist nor socialist?

Cited in the *Decisions on Agricultural Co-operation*, adopted at the Sixth Plenary Session (Enlarged) of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, October 11, 1955

Printed in the People's Republic of China

THE present situation in the countryside is excellent. The hundreds of millions of poor and lower-middle peasants, like the revolutionary masses in the cities, have been fully aroused. Guided by Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, they **fight self and repudiate revisionism** and have considerably enhanced their socialist consciousness. The great revolutionary movement has brought with it a new upsurge in production. The farms have gathered a bumper harvest this year. There are signs of prosperity everywhere in the rural areas.

In carrying forward the great proletarian cultural revolution at the present time in the countryside, an important fighting task is deeper criticism and repudiation of the counter-revolutionary revisionist line which China's Khrushchov advocated for the rural areas and elimination of its poisonous influence.

China is a big country with more than 500 million peasants. The success or failure of China's democratic revolution depended on whether or not the peasant question could be solved correctly. The success or failure of China's socialist revolution likewise depends on how that question is solved. Since the nation-wide victory, the question of whether the Chinese peasants will be led to socialism or capitalism has been decisive for the future of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the future of the socialist system.

It is on this question of primary importance that all through the decade and more since China's liberation, a sharp, tit-for-tat struggle has been going on between the two roads and the two lines.

On the eve of the country-wide liberation, our great leader Chairman Mao pointed out: **"The serious problem is the**

education of the peasantry. . . . Without socialization of agriculture, there can be no complete, consolidated socialism.”¹

Our great helmsman Chairman Mao has formulated a Marxist-Leninist line for the socialist revolution in the countryside. It is a line to wipe out rural capitalist exploitation and bring about the collectivization of agriculture. It is a line to bring about a thoroughgoing socialist revolution on the agricultural front and lead the peasants forward along the broad road of socialism.

But what did the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road — China’s Khrushchov — do on the question of agriculture in the last decade and more?

Before the socialist transformation of agriculture was in the main completed, he did his utmost to protect and develop the rich peasant economy and oppose the socialist collectivization of agriculture. And after the basic completion of that transformation, he made big efforts to restore capitalism and disintegrate the socialist collective economy. He madly sabotaged the socialist revolution in the countryside, and came out against the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants. He pursued an out-and-out counter-revolutionary revisionist line, a line which represented a vain attempt to restore capitalism in the rural areas, a line which would, in fact, allow the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists to make a come-back.

In holding to the socialist road, consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and digging out the roots of revisionism, it is of the utmost importance for us today to use Chairman Mao’s proletarian revolutionary line for systematic and thorough criticism and repudiation of this counter-revolutionary revisionist line of China’s Khrushchov.

¹ Mao Tse-tung, “On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship”, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 419.

CHINA'S KHRUSHCHOV — FANATIC ADVOCATE OF A RICH PEASANT ECONOMY

The founding of the Chinese People's Republic marked the conclusion in the main of the democratic revolution and the start of the socialist revolution in China.

In March 1949, Chairman Mao said in his "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" that **"after the country-wide victory of the Chinese revolution and the solution of the land problem" the basic contradiction internally was "the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie".**¹

He also pointed out:

Scattered, individual agriculture and handicrafts, which make up 90 per cent of the total value of output of the national economy, can and must be led prudently, step by step and yet actively to develop towards modernization and collectivization; the view that they may be left to take their own course is wrong.²

In accordance with this Marxist-Leninist concept of Chairman Mao's on uninterrupted revolution, that is, the concept of moving over without interruption from the stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution to the stage of proletarian socialist revolution, it was necessary to go into action after the land reform and, striking while the iron was hot, immediately develop the mutual-aid and co-operative movement, step by step build socialist relations of production in agriculture, guide the peasants on to the socialist road and restrict and eliminate capitalism in the countryside.

In direct contravention of this proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao's, China's Khrushchov — representing the interests of the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolution-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

² *Ibid.*, p. 368.

aries, bad elements and Rightists — immediately jumped in with his fanatic advocacy of capitalism and desperate opposition to socialism.

It was just a little over a month after the close of the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Party that this man, China's Khrushchov, went to Tientsin and shamelessly lauded the capitalists, putting forward his notorious proposition that "exploitation has its merits".

No sooner had the whole country been liberated than this man, China's Khrushchov, went around fervently advocating development of the rich peasant economy. In January 1950, in his sinister instructions to the big renegade An Tzu-wen, he talked such nonsense as: "At present exploitation saves people and it is dogmatic to forbid it. Exploitation is needed now and it should be welcomed."¹

Directly contradicting the view that agriculture and handicrafts should not be "left to take their own course", put forward by Chairman Mao in his report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee, China's Khrushchov said: "Hiring of farm-hands and individual farming should be left to take their own course. . . . It's good if some rich peasants should emerge as a result." He also campaigned for "no restriction"² on the hiring of hands to till the land, which he said, was "legal" and "benefits the poor people too".³

He babbled: "The type of peasant household which owns three horses, a plough and a cart should increase to 80 per cent [of the total number of rural households] in the next few years."⁴

In a speech he gave in June of the same year, he said: "The policy of preserving the rich peasant economy . . . is a long-term policy."⁵

¹ "Instructions to An Tzu-wen and Others", January 23, 1950.

² *Ibid.*

³ "Letter to Seventh Elder Sister", May 2, 1950.

⁴ "Instructions to An Tzu-wen and Others", January 23, 1950.

⁵ "On the Question of Land Reform", June 14, 1950.

These are the cries of a bloodsucker and in them we can discern the greed and ruthlessness of the exploiting classes, the rural capitalist forces, in their vain attempt to strangle socialism. From first to last, it is the bourgeois philosophy of man-eat-man!

“Exploitation saves people”! “It is legal to hire hands”! What exploitation “saves” is bourgeois “people”, and his “it is legal” is capitalist legality. Is it not crystal clear what evil slime was hidden in the very bones of this No. 1 capitalist roader in the Party, when he so fanatically eulogized the system of exploitation and described as paradise the diabolical enslavement of hired hands?

“The type of peasant household which owns three horses, a plough and a cart should increase”! It is elementary knowledge that in China’s vast countryside, a peasant household owning three horses, a plough and a cart was by no means a middle peasant but a rich peasant household. To increase such peasant households would mean developing a rich peasant economy and enabling capitalism to prevail in the rural areas, so that the poor and lower-middle peasant masses would sink back into the misery of oppression and exploitation, the worker-peasant alliance would be undermined and the dictatorship of the proletariat ruined.

“No restriction”! The zealous praise which this No. 1 capitalist roader heaped on the rich peasant economy had no other purpose than to restrict and smother the enthusiasm of the poor and lower-middle peasants for socialism and clear the way for the capitalist forces. What he clamoured for was “no restriction” upon capitalist exploitation. Such is the class content of what he called freedom!

China’s Khrushchov turned things upside down to deceive the masses when he said: “When peasant households each owning three horses make up 70 per cent [of the total number

of rural households], collective farms can be set up in the future.”¹

There was bitter hatred in his slander of the poor peasants when he said: “Don’t imagine that all those who oppose individual farming are collectivists.”²

This was the greatest insult to the poor peasants and a gross distortion of the socialist collectivization of agriculture! Chairman Mao has pointed out that the broad masses of poor and lower-middle peasants have **“a potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism”**.³ They suffered cruel exploitation at the hands of the landlords and rich peasants and have an intense hatred for the exploitation of man by man. Although their livelihood had improved, even to a great extent, following the land reform, many of them (the poor peasants) were still in considerable economic difficulties, while others (the lower-middle peasants) were still not so well off. This decided their resolute opposition to individual farming and to capitalist exploitation, and their enthusiastic desire to take the road of socialist collectivization. They are the force our Party relies on in the rural areas, where they constitute the main force of the socialist revolution. To attack the poor peasants is to attack the revolution and oppose socialism. To rely on the rich peasants to set up so-called collective farms would produce not socialism, not even a particle of it, but one-hundred-per-cent capitalism.

The absurd theory that collectivization could be brought in only when “peasant households each owning three horses make up 70 per cent [of the total number of rural households]” had no other purpose than to provide a fig-leaf for naked capitalist exploitation. It is a sheer fraud, for it is absolutely impossible for 70 or 80 per cent of the peasants working on

¹ “Instructions to An Tzu-wen and Others”, January 23, 1950.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*, Chinese ed., Vol. II, p. 587.

their own to become rich peasants. Furthermore, everyone knows that once a rich peasant economy prevailed in the rural areas, more than 70 per cent of the peasants would inevitably be forced down once again into the utter destitution and suffering under the oppression of the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists. Such were the "benefits" which China's Khrushchov had in store for the poor people.

China's Khrushchov summed up his whole anti-socialist theory in a programme negating the socialist revolution, namely: "At the present time, we must strive for the consolidation of the system of new democracy."¹

What this meant was protection of the interests of the bourgeoisie and the development of capitalism in town and countryside. In the last analysis, it meant dragging liberated China back to the old road of semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism.

Chairman Mao severely condemned this reactionary programme. In a talk in June 1953, he declared point-blank that **this kind of formulation was harmful**. He pointed out incisively: **The period of transition is full of contradiction and struggle. Our present revolutionary struggle is even deeper than the armed revolutionary struggle of the past. It is a revolution that will for ever bury the capitalist system and all other systems of exploitation. The idea of "firmly establishing the new-democratic social order" is at variance with the realities of the struggle and hinders the development of the socialist cause.**

Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line thoroughly exposed the reactionary essence of China's Khrushchov's line for developing capitalism and pointed out the way forward for the great socialist revolution. Thus there began a great socialist revolution involving hundreds of millions of peasants!

¹ "Speech at a Session of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference", November 4, 1951.

Thus there began a still sharper and more intense struggle between the two roads!

CHINA'S KHRUSHCHOV, THE NO. 1 CAPITALIST ROADER, TRIED TO STRANGLE AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATION

A basic Marxist-Leninist principle which Chairman Mao has consistently upheld is that the proletarian revolutionary Party should lead the peasants along the road of co-operation. In 1943, Chairman Mao issued the great call **"Get Organized!"** in which he incisively pointed out:

Among the peasant masses a system of individual economy has prevailed for thousands of years, with each family or household forming a productive unit. This scattered, individual form of production is the economic foundation of feudal rule and keeps the peasants in perpetual poverty. The only way to change it is gradual collectivization, and the only way to bring about collectivization, according to Lenin, is through co-operatives.¹

Following completion of land reform after the liberation of the whole country, the agricultural mutual-aid and co-operative movement entered a new and higher stage under the guidance of this correct line of Chairman Mao's.

In 1951, the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants in Shansi and other places, acting in accordance with Chairman Mao's teachings, demanded that the mutual-aid teams be raised to the level of agricultural co-operatives on an experimental basis. This was a great revolutionary move. However, working behind Chairman Mao's back, China's Khrushchov wrote the following vicious comment on a report:

After the land reform, the peasants' spontaneous tendency towards capitalism and class polarization began to find ex-

¹ Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. III, p. 156.

pression in economic developments in the countryside. Some comrades in the Party have already expressed fears of such spontaneous tendency and class polarization, and have attempted to check or prevent them. They cherish the illusion that this tendency can be checked or prevented by means of mutual-aid working teams and supply and marketing co-operatives. Some people have expressed the opinion that steps should be taken gradually to shake the foundations of private ownership, weaken it until it is nullified, and raise the mutual-aid organizations for agricultural production to the level of agricultural producers' co-operatives as a new factor for "overcoming the peasants' spontaneous tendency". This is an erroneous, dangerous and Utopian conception of agricultural socialism.¹

See how bitterly this No. 1 capitalist roader who attempted to strangle agricultural co-operation hated the enthusiasm with which the poor and lower-middle peasants were taking the socialist road!

These remarks of China's Khrushchov were a confession of his opposition to Chairman Mao and Mao Tse-tung's thought and of his intense hatred for the poor and lower-middle peasants. He had the audacity to slander the socialist line of agricultural co-operation as an "illusion" and vilify as "dangerous" and "Utopian" the new-born things of socialism which emerged and grew in real life by breaking through the capitalist forces. His anti-socialist, counter-revolutionary bourgeois stand is here exposed to the full. We can almost hear him gnash his teeth in his hatred for socialism!

On reading these remarks, our great leader Chairman Mao was filled with indignation; he resolutely refuted these absurdities. Chairman Mao has creatively and in a most comprehensive way developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of agricultural

¹ "Comment on the Report Submitted by the Shansi Provincial Party Committee: 'Raise the Mutual-Aid Organizations in the Old Liberated Areas to a Higher Level'", July 3, 1951.

co-operation under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was he who personally formulated the first decision of the Central Committee of the Party on mutual aid and co-operation in agricultural production and victoriously guided the advance of the agricultural co-operative movement. The conspiracy of China's Khrushchov went bankrupt.

In 1953 when the national economy was in the main rehabilitated and the land reform was in the main completed throughout the country, Chairman Mao put forward our Party's general line and general task for the transitional period. He pointed out: **After the success of the democratic revolution, some people stood still. Failing to realize the change in the character of the revolution, they continued with their "new democracy" instead of undertaking socialist transformation. Hence their Rightist errors. As far as agriculture is concerned, the socialist road is the only road for our country. The development of the mutual-aid and co-operative movement and the constant growth of the productive forces in agriculture are the heart of the Party's tasks in the countryside.**

Guided by the beacon of the general line for the transitional period, the socialist enthusiasm of the peasant masses soared to new heights and semi-socialist, elementary agricultural co-operatives sprang up everywhere like mushrooms. Confronted by this excellent situation, the No. 1 capitalist roader in the Party and his collaborators were thrown into a panic. They hurriedly issued orders and, exclaiming against "rashness", forced the peasants to "withdraw from the co-operatives and return to mutual-aid teams". A number of newly established elementary agricultural co-operatives were thus smothered.

1955 saw a nation-wide upsurge in agricultural co-operation in response to Chairman Mao's great call. But seizing the opportunity presented by Chairman Mao's absence from Peking, China's Khrushchov once again masterminded criminal activities against "rashness". In May of that year, he and another top capitalist roader in the Party concocted the reactionary policy of "holding up", "contraction" and "check-

ing up", and he personally ratified a plan for drastically slashing the number of co-operatives. In a little over two months, 200,000 co-operatives were dissolved in the country.

To this day, this Khrushchov of China adamantly refuses to admit his guilt. But there is so much conclusive evidence that no attempts at evasion on his part will work. His hundred and one sly sophistries only serve to expose more fully his incorrigibly reactionary features and his heinous crimes.

Seeking theoretical grounds for his opposition to the agricultural co-operative movement, China's Khrushchov had recourse to the out-worn weapon of "the theory of productive forces" taken from the revisionist rubbish heap of his forerunners, Bernstein, Kautsky, Bukharin and their like. He declared: "Only with the nationalization of industry can large quantities of machinery be supplied the peasants, and only then will it be possible to nationalize the land and collectivize agriculture."¹

His theory of "mechanization before co-operation" long ago went ignominiously bankrupt during the movement for the socialist transformation of agriculture. He denied the great revolutionary role of the masses, the main and most active factor in the productive forces. He completely negated such factors as the tremendously stimulating impact of the relations of production and the superstructure on the productive forces. According to his theory, in countries where the productive forces are not yet well developed, the proletariat and the poor and lower-middle peasants, after winning victory in the democratic revolution, are not entitled to and should not pass over to the socialist revolution without delay; instead, they must let capitalism develop first. Without machinery, they deserve to be exploited by the capitalists and rich peasants.

If things had been done in accordance with his theory, it would have led inevitably to the abandonment of both socialist

¹ "Speech at the Conference on Propaganda Work", May 7, 1951.

agricultural co-operation and the socialist industrialization of our country.

If things had been done in accordance with his theory, would not the socialist revolutionary cause have been forfeited long ago; would not our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat have been turned into a state of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie?

It is quite obvious that "mechanization before co-operation" was nothing but a pretext used by China's Khrushchov to oppose the socialist transformation of agriculture and the socialist revolution. His criminal purpose was to develop capitalism in China's rural areas, let landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and the Rightists stage a come-back and make the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants beasts of burden for the landlords and rich peasants.

At the moment when the agricultural co-operative movement was facing strangulation by the No. 1 capitalist roader in the Party, our great leader Chairman Mao made his famous report, *On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation*, and later wrote the preface and editor's notes to the book *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*. In these epoch-making documents written with genius, Chairman Mao solved the problem of the socialist transformation of agriculture in a scientific, systematic and comprehensive way. He has thus tremendously enriched and developed Marxism-Leninism and smashed, both in theory and in practice, the unbridled attacks by China's Khrushchov and company.

Chairman Mao spoke highly of the socialist enthusiasm of the broad masses of the peasants. He said with great warmth:

Daily and hourly throughout the countryside the socialist factors are increasing. The great majority of the peasants are demanding the formation of co-operatives. A large number of intelligent, capable, fair-minded and enthusiastic

leaders are springing from the midst of the people. This is a very encouraging situation.¹

Chairman Mao denounced the opportunism of China's Khrushchov and others who vainly attempted to stem the tide of history. He penetratingly pointed out that **"taking the stand of the bourgeoisie, of the rich peasants, or of the well-to-do middle peasants with their spontaneous tendency towards capitalism, they always think in terms of the interests of the few"**.²

Chairman Mao has given a profound exposition of the dialectical relationship between agricultural collectivization and socialist industrialization and repudiated the absurd theory of "mechanization before co-operation" put forward by China's Khrushchov. Chairman Mao pointed out:

. . . with conditions as they are in our country co-operation must precede the use of big machinery (in capitalist countries agriculture develops in a capitalist way). . . we must on no account regard industry and agriculture, socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture as two separate and isolated things, and on no account must we emphasize the one and play down the other.³

Chairman Mao's brilliant thesis solves this important problem of universal significance: In countries where industry is less developed, it is necessary and possible — after the proletariat has led the democratic revolution to victory — to pass into the socialist revolution in good time and, relying on the powerful dictatorship of the proletariat, carry out socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production

¹ *The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*, Chinese ed., Vol. III, p. 1204.

² **Mao Tse-tung, *On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation*, Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1967, p. 21.**

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.