JPRS: 5911

21 November 1960

SELECTED ARTICLES FROM KUANG-MING DAILY ON IDEOLOGICAL SUBJECTS

-- COMMUNIST CHINA --

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
1636 CONNECTICUT AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

JPRS: 5911

CSO: 5141-N

SELECTED ARTICLES FROM

KUANG-MING DAILY ON IDEOLOGICAL SUBJECTS

Table of Contents

U. S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CANNOT CHANGE U. S. AGGRESSIVE AND WARLIKE POLICIES

/Following is a full translation of an article entitled "Mei-kuo ti tsung-t'ung Hsuan-chu pu-hui kai-pien Mei-kuo ti ch'in-lueh cheng-ts'e ho chan-tseng cheng-ts'e" (English version above), written by Ch'ang-kung, appearing in Kuang-ming Jih-pao, Peiping, 30 August 1960, page 4./

U. S. imperialism is the arch-enemy of the people of the whole world. It has consistently carried out aggressive and warlike policies. Even the platforms recently made public by the Republican and Democratic parties give out a strong smell of gunpowder and make no secret of their ambition for world conquest. The two platforms clearly indicate that, whatever intrigues are involved in the U. S. presidential election, the inherently warlike character of U. S. imperialism and the aggressive and belligerent policies pursued by it will not change to the slightest extent.

Imperialism relies basically on aggression and war for its existence. In order to seek incessantly the highest profit, it can never forsake its aggressive and warlike policies. This is the inherent character of imperialism nad has been decided by the basic systems of imperialist countries.

The U. S. Democratic and Republican parties are both tools for the implementation of the reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the U. S. monopolist and capitalist cliques. In class formation and political viewpoints, there is no difference between the two parties. They are both instruments in the hands of the monopolist and capitalist classes for deceiving the people and controlling the State machinery. The disputes between the two parties of course reflect the conflict among the various monopolist cliques; but, under the over-all arrangement in Wall Street, these disputes are but subterfuges to create misunderstanding among the people and to divert attention from their vital interests. The U. S. presidential election and the two-party rivalry are no more than tricks for deceiving the people.

The U. S. monopolist and capitalist classes utilize

the alternating administration of the two parties as a means of uninterruptedly continuing to carry out their domestic and foreign policies. Moreover, by means of the propaganda of the two parties, the law and other measures, the U. S. monopolist and capitalist classes contrive to restrain the activities of the workers' party and other parties. As a result, the people of the U. S. have had to confine their choice to the candidates of only the Republican and Democratic parties, and these two candidates are usually birds of same feather. The two parties have no fixed political platforms and no fixed memberships; and it is only during elections that they adopt certain slogans and platforms. This shows all the more clearly that the two parties are merely the tools of the monopolist and capitalist classes for maintaining their administrative power.

The expenses of the two parties for their election campaigns are in the great majority of cases borne by the monopolist and capitalist classes. During the elections of 1948 and 1952, most of the funds were raised by the Rockefeller financial group. In the 1956 election, the amount contributed by one-third of the directors of 100 largest corporations in the U. S. exceeded $500 million. It is noteworthy that many large capitalists contribute to the campaign funds of both parties. In the election of 1956, the Vanderbilt, Harriman, Lehman and Field families made contributions to both parties.

While nominally the presidential candidates are selected by the two party conventions, actually they are decided by the monopolist and capitalist classes and their party representatives behind the scenes. In accordance with their decision, the monopolists and capitalists insure the nomination of their own candidate by paying a high price for convention votes or by some other means. In the 1952 Republican convention, for instance, Aldrich, chairman of the Board of Directors of the then Chase National Bank, a member of the Rockefeller financial group, paid an average of $2,800 for each vote cast for Eisenhower, the Republican candidate. Even after the selection of the candidates of the two parties, the campaigns are carried on entirely under the direction of the monopolist and capitalist classes. Prior to the presidential election of 1952, the Chase National Bank had solicited votes for Eisenhower through its 3,800 branches in the country.

The above are only some of the scandals leaked out at

random by the monopolist and capitalist press in the U. S. From them we can see something of the farce in the U. S. election. Be it the Republican administration of McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover or Eisenhower, or be it the Democratic administration of Wilson, F. D. Roosevelt or Truman, they all loyally carried out the policies of the monopolist and capitalist classes.

Noxon, the Republican candidate this time, has confessed: "Our political parties are organized for the seizure of political power, and should be formed on the present basis. It would be very dangerous if the two parties were entirely different in principle because then the transfer of power from one party to the other would imply a basic change." Of course, in carrying out their aggressive and warlike policies, the suggessive administrations of the U. S. have encountered many difficulties, which have become more and more numerous. Therefore, for the purpose of capturing votes and deceiving the people, the parties are compelled to adopt different slogans and make certain changes in their strategy. If we do not confuse slogans with reality, we cannot regard the change of slogans and strategy as a change of policy. Especially since the conslusion of World War II, the monopolist and capitalist classes of the U. S. have advocated so-called "bi-partisan diplomacy". There is all the less reason for imagining that any modification of their foreign policy will take place when there is a change in administratinn.

The present Republican President, Eisenhower, served as the supreme commander of the North Atlantic aggressive forces under the Democratic administration of Truman. The former's Secretary of State, Dulles, was once adviser to Truman's State Department, and went in person to the 38th parallel in Korea to plan the war of aggression against that country. Since 1955, the U. S. congress with a Democratic majority, has never failed to support the aggressive and warlike activities of the Republicans. This all the more exposes the "lie" that the policies of the two parties are any "different".

All U. S. politicians and U. S. State machinery are tools of the capitalist and monopolist classes. It is these classes, and not any politician, that can decide U. S. foreign policy. Any politician whose individual views run counter to the interest of the monopolist and capitalist classes cannot aspire to the presidential office. Thus, we

cannot harbor any illusion regarding either party, nor should we do so regarding the presidential candidate of either party.

In order to explain the fact that the U. S. presidential election cannot result in any change in the U. S. Government's aggressive and warlike policies, let us make a concrete analysis of the platforms of the two parties and their presidential candidates.

This year's Republican platform has a strong smell of gunpowder and clamors for increased armament expansion and war preparation. It tirelessly details many requirements and concrete measures for armament expansion, such as nuclear retaliatory power which "can destroy any possible enemy", "highly mobile and versatile forces" for engaging in any limited warfare, the maintenance of "a necessary number of strategic air command bombers on airborne alert", continued development and production of new weapons fo war, continued priority and development of long-range guided missiles, "constant intelligence operations regarding Communist military preparations", etc. Who can see here any sign of abandoning the policy of armament expansion and war preparation? The Republic platform does not savor in any way of a willingness to have "peaceful coexistence" with the Socialist camp. On the contrary, it shows the "determination" to bring about the "independence" of such Eastern European Socialist countries as Hungary, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Bulgaria and such members of the Soviet Union as Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia; that is to say, to carry out subversion and seek the restoration of capitalism in thses areas.

At the same time, the Republican platform indicates that the party will continue to support the aggresive military groups of NATO, CENTO and SEATO and, by means of "the vigor and funds needed", to give "military assistance" to the "allies" of the U. S. Without any concealment, the Republican platform shows its hatred for the movement of national independence being vigorously developed from Africa to Latin America and reaffirms the application of the notorious "Monroe Doctrine" to Latin America under the pretext of "America for the Americans" to subject the peoples of Latin America to perpetual exploitation and enslavement by U. S. imperialism. Thus, it can be said that the Republican platofrm has reaffirmed and reinforced the various aspects of the aggressive and warlike policies currently pursued by the U. S.

The Republican presidential candidate, Nixon, is the incumbent Vice President of the Eisenhower administration and also a direct participant in the implementation of its aggressive and warlike policies. Nixon owes his role in the political arena to the financial circles of Los Angeles, California. Since his election to the Vice Presidency, he has entered into close relations with the financial circles of Wall Street and has pledged loyal service to them. He has consistently rendered active lip service to the promotion of both hot and cold war. During the Korean War, he strongly advocated the extension of that war of aggression to our Northeast and clamored for the blockade of our coast. After the end of that war as a result of the defeat of U. S. imperialism, Nixon made the outcry that the U. S. should directly intervene in and extend the Indo-Chinese War. With the collapse of the summit conference in consequence of U. S. sabotage, Nixon publicly declared that the contradictions between the U. S. and the Soviet Union could only be resolved by war. Since his nomination as the Republican presidential candidate, he has given vent to the necessity of putting military power above every other consideration and has made it clear that merely to "curb" Communism and "defend" the present bases of U. S. Aggression is not enough; it is necessary to map out "brand-new" anti-Communist strategy, to strengthen the "control of the Pacific" and to bring "freedom" (which should in fact read as "enslavement") to the peoples of all countries.

From this it can be seen that, if the Republican party should succeed in the election, there could doubtless be no change in the U. S. aggressive and warlike policies.

Is it any different with the Democrats? Not at all. In spite of the fact that the Democratic party, as the opposition party, has made numerous attacks on the Republican administration, this does not mean any important conflict about the aggressive and warlike policies between the two parties. The attacks only constitute criticisms implying that, so far as external aggression is concerned, the Republican party is still wide of the mark. While on certain issues the Democratic platform contains a number of points differing in approach and emphasis from the Republican position, it has not made any change in the basic U. S. aggressive and warlike policies.

The Democratic platform states: "We must first restore our national strength" and "the new Democratic adminis-

tration will recast our military capability" in order to provide "a great diversity of forces and weapons, balance and mobility" sufficient in "quantity and quality" to wage limited as well as general warfare. Quite evidently, the Democratic party, like the Republican party, attach first importance to the policy of strength and to armament expansion and war preparation. It criticises the Republican party for not going far enough and claims that the Democrats once in power will "restore" strength and "recast" military capability.

The Democratic platform further states that it will not "abandon peoples who are now behind the Iron Curtain through any formal approval of the status quo." That is to say, the Democratic party, like the Republican party, will not willingly accept the permanent extinction of capitalist system in Socialist countries and will seek its restoration. So far as China policy is concerned, the Democratic platform also concurs with the Republican platform in insisting on antagonism toward the Chinese people, and it has not forgotten to proclaim clearly its policy of continuing occupation of the Chinese Territory of Taiwan by force.

The Democratic platform supports the Republican policy on West Berlin and the policy of reliance on the aggressive military clique. It clamors for the establishment of a so-called "world order" under the control of the U. S. The Democratic party has also indicated that its administration will unhesitatingly observe the "obligations" and "responsibilities" the U. S. has assumed under its aggressive treaties and agreements with Latin American countries.

The Democratic platform stresses the importance of ideological infiltration in Socialist countries and of enticing nationalist countries with "economic assistance". This goes to show that, in addition to force, the Democratic platform advocates the use of even more sinister means to carry out U. S. aggressive and warlike policies.

Thus, in the Democratic platform, we can likewise fine no indication of any change in the basic U. S. policy.

The Democratic presidential candidate is Senator Kennedy. His father is a great financier and capitalist from Boston and is one of the seventy-five wealthiest men in the U. S. The Boston financial group was once one of the

Big Eight. Although it has suffered some reverses in recent years, it has allied itself more intimately with the Morgan and Rockefeller financial groups of Wall Street. Kennedy's appearance on the political stage is due to his financial background and his father's direct guidance. In his speeches in the Senate in relation to U. S. foreign policy, he has never expressed any direct opposition to the policy itself. In May this year, when a U. S. espionage plane was shot down in the Soviet Union and when Eisenhower wildly played his roguish tricks, Kennedy at once cabled him his support. At the Democratic convention in July this year, Kennedy said: "We should not make the mistake of letting the enemy take our election compaign debates as disunity in basic principle on the issue of our country's anti-Communist policy." Indeed, in one of his policy speeches, he has brought up a twelve-point plan for armament expansion and war preparation andproposed the increase of military expenditure from $2.5 billion to $3 billion.

Thus, it is likewise discernible that, if the Democratic party should win the election, there would be no change in U. S. aggressive and warlike policies.

Today, when the East wind continues to prevail over the West wind, the situation is becoming more and more unfavorable to U. S. imperialism, and its days are getting more and more troublesome. In an attempt to overcome this trouble, the monopoly capitalists of Wall Street can henceforth only continue to carry out their forlorn struggle. The two platforms bear witness to this tendency. The law of development of all imperialism is: trouble making, defeat, trouble making again, defeat again and finally extinction. The U. S. cannot be an exception under this law. What the U. S. presidential election is demonstrating is exactly such an inevitable development.

Therefore, be it a Republican or Democratic administration that emerges from this election, U. S. imperialism is still U. S. imperialism, and no change will be possible in U. S. aggressive and warlike policies. All peace-loving peoples of the world must be united, resolutely struggle against the aggressive and warlike policies of U. S. imperialism and preserve world peace. They must inflict a greater defeat on the new conspiracy of U. S. imperialism and harbor no illusion toward the farce of U. S. presidential election.

IS IT POSSIBLE THAT PHYSICAL LABOR WILL NOT EXIST IN A COMMUNIST SOCIETY?

A Discussion with Comrade Feng Ts'e

/The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Nan-tao kung-ch'an she-hui chiupu ts'un-tsai t'i-li lao-tung ma?" (English version above), written by I-ch'uan, appearing in Kuang-ming Jih-pao, Peiping, 5 September 1960, page 4./

Three articles written by Comrades Ching Ssu-erh and Feng Tse have successively been published in Nos 51 and 54 of this paper. They deal with the problem whether there will be clumsy and heavy physical labor in a Communist society. The following are my views on these articles now submitted to the criticism and correction of the readers.

I

Comrade Ching's article (entitled "Clumsyand Heavy Physical Labor Cannot be Eliminated in a Communist Society") has proved that clumsy and heavy physical labor still exists in a Communist society. We feel that, although in some respects Comrade Ching's article merits some re-examination, it must be affirmed at the outset that its basic direction is correct. This is so, because he has upheld the Marxist-Leninist concept that physical labor still exists in a Communist society. In spite of the intimate union of physical with mental labor and in spite of the resultant reduction of both physical labor intensity and working hours, it is an indisputable fact that physical labor will still exist in a Communist society.

However, in discussion the question of physical labor or of effacing the distinction between physical and mental labor, some people entertain a certain measure of capitalist thinking. They feel that the elimination of the distinction between physical and mental labor means the destruction of the former and the retention of the latter, rather than the intimate union and coexistence of the two. They believe that the road of effacing the distinction betwen physical and mental labor leads only to the conversion of physical into

mental workers and to the former learning from the latter. As a result, mental workers become the teachers of physical laborers and do not have to learn from physical workers or participate in physical labor and actual proeuction. The exponents of this theory even hold that the transfer of cadres to lower levels for labor and the participation of intellectuals in physical labor constitute a "waste of talent". They use this as an argument against the Party's wise policy of letting Marxist-Leninist cadres and intellectuals participate in physical labor.

We must criticize and draw a clear line against this group of people and this sort of thinking. We believe that Comrade Ching has not overdone in his criticism; on the contrary, he has not done enough. However, we must recognize that the main theme of his article is in the right direction and is consistent with the criticism against capitalist thinking concerning the question of pnysical labor. It is also consistent with the Party's policy of encouraging cadres and intellectuals to participate in physical labor.

From this point of view, Comrade Feng Ts'e's criticism against Ching Ssu-erh's article seems to be in the direction wrong and cannot hold its ground. This is a question concerning the partisan character of economic science and concerning the attitude and methodology we should take in the debate. If this question is not colved, our debate may become trivial, boring and even sophisticated.

Of course, even affirming at the outset that the basic direction of Comrade Ching's article is correct, we feel that it also calls for some re-examination in certain respects. For example, it may be a more effective in criticizing capitalist thinking if he discusses from real life the concrete road to the elimination of the distinction between physical and mental labor. Also, it may be desirable for him to explain the difference between physical labor in a Communist society, where it is completely united with mental labor, and physical labor in a society where it is entirely separated from mental labor. Furthermore, it may not be proper to affirm the existence of clumsy and heavy labor at a higher level of Communism. All these points call for some further scrutiny.

II

The elimination of the distinction between physical

and mental labor and the intimate union of the two constitute one of the necessary conditions for a transition to Communist society, and on this point there is no longer any theoretical disagreement. However, a difference of opinion arises as soon as we come to the question of what concrete road we should take to effect the transition. Herein lie diversions in theory.

The Party and Chairman Mao have summed up their rich experiences in Socialist revolution and Socialist construction, and have mapped out a concrete road for eliminating the distinction between physical and mental labor. This road consists in the union of education with productive labor, the transfer of cadres and intellectuals to lower levels for labor training, their participation in labor, the participation of cadres in production, the participation of the laboring (peasant) masses in management, the union of the Party's leading cadres, technicians and the laboring (peasant) masses, and the penetrative participation of leading cadres on the first line of production.

In a word, the basic content of this concrete road is the intimate union of the worker-peasant meaasses with the intellectuals. On the one hand, we should increase the knowledge of the worker-peasant masses in relation to social struggle from an intuitive level to a self-conscious and scientific level. On the other hand, we should let the cadres and intellectuals participate directly in physical labor, actual production and basic social activities. They must become productive workers themselves, convert their indirect knowledge into direct knowledge, rationalize their emotional attachment to the masses, and develop scientific theories from their rich parctical experiences in order to better guide actual production and help the worker-peasant masses raise their cultural standard. On the one hand, the masses should acquire cultural and scientific knowledge from the intellectuals and cadres; on the other, the cadres and intellectuals should learn from the worker-peasant masses regarding production, and change their own world outlook. In short, only by intimately unifying the two sides and by laying special emphasis on the participation of cadres and intellectuals in labor and production can we better reform both our subjective and objective world. Also, only on the basis of increasingly elevating the political consciousness anc cultural level of the people and on the basis of uninterruptedly development of t e erlations of production and the productive forces can we gradually wipe out the distinc-

tion between physical and mental labor and better unite the two.

Now, the important point is that cadres and intellectuals must participate in physical labor and production. Why? Here are the reasons: First, their participation may strengthen their relationship with the masses, increase their awareness of the hardship of the workers and peasants, cultivate their intimate feeling toward the working class and help eradicate their capitalist thinking of belittling physical labor .

Secondly, at the present stage, participation in production implies participation in physical labor. Therefore, it is only through such participation that knowledge of production can be obtained, natural phenomena can be got acquainted with, and scientific techniques can be fully developed. This will lead to the acceleration of Socialist construction at a high speed. In his article "On Practice", Chairman Mao has pointed out: "First of all, Marxists recognize that the productive activities of mankind are basic practical activities, which determine all other activities. People's understanding relies principally on material productive activities, which will lead to the gradual recognition of the phenomena, character and regularity of nature, as well as the relations between man and nature, and to the gradual recognition, in varying degrees, of the relations between man and man. Apart from productive activities all this knowledge is unattainable."

Thirdly, only through the participation of cadres and intellectuals in labor and in basic-level productive activities can natural and social sciences be better developed, and the knowledge pertaining to such sciences be better imparted to the worker-peasant masses. As we are aware, only when the Communist consciousness of the masses is greatly elevated and natural and social sciences are fully and universally mastered by the people can a Communist society come into existence.

However, the worker-peasant masses can only reach this objective under the Party's leadership by two ways. On the one hand, there should be energetic promotion of mass movements so as to mobilize the creative power of the millions of workers and peasants. On the other, the help of intellectuals is indispensable. There is no question that the worker-peasant masses are willing to make cultural

studies, but the question is: how do the intellectuals help the masses in their study? In other words, in what way will the intellectuals put themselves at the service of the masses? The thing to do is for the intellectuals to plunge themselves enthusiastically into actual production, physical labor and the flamboyant mass movements in order to enrich, elevate and develop the workers' scientific knowledge. Otherwise, the intellectuals would not be able to fulfill their historic mission, or serve the cause of the worker-peasant masses.

Therefore, we can see that there are two opposing views on the concrete way of eliminating the distinction between physical and mental labor. The first view is that our historic mission should be regarded as the joint task of the worker-peasant masses and the intellectuals. This is the Marxist-Leninist concept. We should be all means insist on to defend this concept.

The other view is that, so long as the masses can become learned, there is no necessity for the intellectuals to become one of the rank and file masses. It is believed that the elimination of the distinction between physical and mental labor is a one-sided affair. That is to say, it involves nothing more than the masses learning from the intellectuals. The intellectuals do not have to participate in labor, nor do they have to join the glorious ranks of the millions of workers and peasnats in their struggle, or to learn from the masses. It is said that "the gain does not offset the loss" when cadres and intellectuals are transferred to lower levels to participate in physical labor. It is regarded as a "waste of talent". It is also said that the elimination of the distinction between pnysical and mental labor depends to a great extent on the development of scientific technique.

In short, the exponents of this view deny the necessity of changing the world outlook of the cadres and intellectuals. They deny the great significance of their participation in production and physical labor vis-a-vis the development of production and scientific technique. They deny the meaning of energetic promotion of mass scientific movements as a result of the union of cadres, intellectuals with the worker-peasant masses. They deny the extreme importance of combining a high degree of Communist consciousness with scientific progress in the elimination of the distinction between physical and mental labor. They despise

physical labor, oppose the mass line of cultural and scientific development and deviate from actual production and from the masses. This is a capitalist concept, which we resolutely oppose.

We believe that, when we discuss the question whether physical labor exists in a Communist society, we must not abandon the concrete road to the elimination of the distinction between physical and mental labor. If we did, it would be either a mistake in principle or an inexcusable negligence.

III

We should make a further query as to whether the elimination of the distinction between physical and mental labor is equivalent to the eradication of physical labor and the preservation of mental labor. It is decidedly not so simple. We can only say that, in a Communist society, owing to the people's high level of Communist consciousness and the advanced development of scientific technique, physical and mental labor exist simultaneously in such a way that the two kinds of labor are unified and co-exist as a matter of social division of labor. Then, people can work equally well as physical and mental laborers, and labor will become a primary requirement of human life. Then, also, the required labor intensity and the working hours will be greatly reduced, and mankind will be equipped with all the conditions for total development.

On this score, the article of Comrade Feng Ts'e (entitled "Will Clumsy and Heavy Physical Labor Still Exist in a Communist Society?") merits some re-examination. On the one hand, Comrade Feng objects to the idea that physical labor still exists in a Communist society, while he himself states: "When the distinction (between physical and mental labor) is wiped out, all people become intellectuals." Are these intellectuals mental workers? If so, why does he not permit others to say that there is physical labor, while he himself asserts that there are only intellectuals? Quite evidently, this is a contradiction arising out of Comrade Feng's objection to the existence of physical labor in a Communist society. Of course, in hastening to criticize the viewpoint of others, he cannot help exposing his concept of "intellectuals".

Again, Comrade Feng objects to the idea of drawing a distinction between "mental labor" and "physical labor" in a communist society, but he himself declares that in a

Communist society the two are unified (here he implies that all people are not the same). Thenit can be said that people can be "physical" and "mental" workers at the same time and that the two kinds of labor can become one. Here, we can see that Comrade Feng still contradicts himself, since he opposes and agrees with others at the same time.

How shall we resolve this contradiction? This can be done in either of two ways: First, Comrade Feng only criticizes the failure of others to regard physical and mental labor as two separate conceptions under Communist social productive labor (whether this criticism is correct or whether others have made this theoretical mistake is another question). If so, he should admit his own mistake in objecting to the existence of physical labor in a Communist society. Secondly, Comrade Feng only criticizes the incorrectnessof others' contention that physical labor still exists in a Communist society. If so, he must admit the incorrectness of his own standpoint that "the two kinds of labor become one."

It is certainly unthinkable for a writer to criticize in the same article someone else's conception of the existence of physical labor and permit himself to make use of the very same conception. Since he gives evidence of committing this fallacy, his writing only reflects confused thinking. Judging by the main theme of the whole article, his confused thinking is inclined to deny, or at least to show the reluctance of recognizing, the existence of physical labor in a Communist society. This is rather unfortunate.

"All our cultural and educational workers must be aware that all social wealth can only be created through the physical labor of man. It was so in the past, it is so now and it will be so in the future. The exploiting class belittles physical labor and physical workers. We must regard physical labor as the first requirement of human life. We must make the people of the whole country conscious and cultural workers". This directive is found in the "Greetings to the Conference of National Heroes of Culture and Education", delivered on 1 June 1960 by Comrade Lu Ting-i on behalf of the CCP Central Committee and the State Council. These remarks throw a great deal of light on the question under discussion.

As to whether there is clumsy and heavy labor at a well developed Communist society, especially whether such

labor is still necessary, there is still room for further study. We believe that in a Communist society there will still be physical labor, including such labor that makes men perspire; there will be varying degrees of distinction in physical labor, and under given conditions such distinction will still be considerable sharp. However, to sum up, firstly it is unnecessary to use the concept of clumsy and heavy labor, and secondly it is improper to place freely a misfitting label on those who do not think there will be clumsy and heavy labor in a Communist society.

DID ENGLES TAKE PRODUCTIVE FORCES AS A SUBJECT OF STUDY IN POLITICAL ECONOMY?

Refutation of A Point Raised by P'ing-hsin

/The following is a full translation of an article entitled "En-ko-ssu pa sheng-ch'an-li tang-tso cheng-chih-ching-chi-hsueh yen-chiu tui-hsiang ma? - Po P'ing-hsin Hsien-sheng Ti I-ko Lun-tien" (English version above), written by Ch'en Chen-wei, appearing in Kuang-ming Jih-pao, Peiping, 5 September 1960, page 4./

Mr. P'ing-hsin has made public several articles dealing with the nature of productive forces, and has therein touched upon the question of subjects, tasks and monenclature of political economy. I feel that many of the points advanced by Mr. P'ing-hsin are non-Marxist-Leninist and merit some re-examination. This article is confined to a discussion of the subjects of study of political economy, and special studies will be made separately on other questions.

It is well-known that political economy is a social science devoted to the study of the laws governing the relations of production or economic relations. It was in the 17th century when the capitalist form of production made its first appearance that political economy became an independent science. Following the development of the relations of production and the growth of their contradictions, political economy became a system of economic thought representing the interests of a given class.

Capitalist political economy began with mercantilism, and has gone through the historical stages of physiocraticism and the English classical capitalist political economy. The emergence of Marxist political economy was a great revolutionary change, and it is an important component part of Marxist theory. In his work "Herr Eugen Duehring's Revolution in Science (Anti-Duehring)," Engels has correctly pointed out that "the entire theoretical content" of the proletarian party "was born out of the study of political economy". Marxist political economy is radically different from classical capitalist political economy, and is a powerful weapon for proletarian revolution and the overthrow of capitalist rule.

The subjects of study of political economy as a tool of the proletarian revolution are the laws on the development of people's social relations, i.e., the relations of production. Lenin has given an extremely precise definition of the subjects of study of political economy. "Political economy", he says, "is devoted, not to the study of 'production', but to that of the social relations of production and the social system of production." (Lieh-ning Ch'uan-chi, vol. 3, p 42). But Mr. P'ing-hsin does not concur with this definition and has expressed a revisionist and indeed unique view. He states: "Whether the subjects of study of political economy include productive forces is a question which merits extended discussion. Some comrades believe that the question hasllong been answered, that is to say, economics is a science devoted to the study of the laws on the relations of production and having nothing to do with productive forces. I do not think that the answer to this question is so simple. Irrespective of whether we proceed from the directives of Marxist classics relative to the task of studying economics, from the objective laws governing the development of social economy (including the laws governing the coexistence of and contradictions between productive forces and the relations of production), from the requirements of the development of social economy or from the long-term development of economics, we cannot deduce the conclusion that economics is devoted merely to the study of the relations of production and has nothing to do with productive forces." (Hsueh-shu Yueh-k'an, no 12, 1959)

It is said that Mr. P'ing-hsin found the basis of his contention in Engels' "Anti-Duehring". Mr. P'ing-hsin says: "According to my superficial observation, engles' statement in his 'Anti-Duehring' to the effect that 'political economy, in its broadest sense, is a science for the study of those laws which control the production and exchange of materials for living in human society' requires thorough understanding. What Engels calls production is certainly not confined to the relations of prouction and necessarily includes productive forces. What he calls exchange also necessarily includes the exchange of products and exchange of activities. Since economics in a broad sense should study the laws controlling the production and exchange of materials, it is inconceivable that this science should exclude the laws relative to the structure and movement of productive forces and confine itself to the study of the relations of production." (Hsueh-shu Yueh-k'an, No 4, 1960)

Here, Mr. P'ing-hsin's conclusion is that what Engels calls production is certainly not confined to the relations of production and necessarily includes productive forces. Therefore, Mr. P'ing-hsin believes that the subjects of study of political economy not only include productive forces, but place them on an equally important footing with the relations of production.

It is discernible that the understanding of Mr. P'ing-hsin regarding the writing of Engels, one of the great pioneers of scientific Communism, is incorrect. What Engels said about economics in the broad sense was in contrast to the political economy in the restricted sense of the 17th and 18th centuries. To widen the field of the subjects of study of political economy so as not to confine it to the social phenomena of capitalism but to extend it to "the study of those conditions and forms under which production and exchange are carried out in all societies of mankind" is decidedly not the same as to include in the study "the laws relative to the structure and movement of productive forces", as propsed by Mr. P'ing-hsin.

Productive forces are one aspect of production. They indicate the relation between man and nature. To be more exact, they represent the relation between man and the forces of nature, and the way to obtain the necessary materials for the struggle of man with nature. We think that productive forces do not constitute a subject of study in Marxist political economy, as they are a part of natural science and technology.

In his "anti-Duehring", Engels writes: "In the broad sense, political economy is a science devoted to the study of those conditions and forms under which production and exchange are carried out in all societies of mankind and those conditions and forms under which the corresponding distribution of products is carried out..." The word "conditions" here denotes the social conditions of production, i.e., relations of production. Before entering into production, people must first have fixed social conditions in addition to productive forces. Production cannot proceed without a definite human relation developed during the course of men's effort to influence nature.

Marx once said: "The social relations between producers and conditions under which they exchange their labor and participate in joint production vary, of course, when

the nature of materials for production varies." "In short, social relations or the social relations of production in which individuals carry out production are developed, modified and changed in accordance with variations in the materials for production." Again, "Are not materials for living, tools for labor and raw materials, which make up capital, produced and accumulated under given social conditions and given social relations? Are they not all utilized for new production under given social conditions and given social relations?" (Ma-En Wen-hsuan, Vol 1, p 67)

It is clear that both Marx and Engels regard the conditions for carrying out production as the relations of production. Here, what have been described as forms of production and exchange denote the forms of possession of materials for production and the end products, that is, to whom the materials for production belong and what is the system of ownership of end products which in turn is determined by the system of ownership of materials for production. To construe ownership as a concept linked up with all other economic concepts is an important principle of Marxist political economy. Historically, ownership is a given social phenomenon of possession, which can determine the social and economic nature of production and social system.

In "Anti-Duehring", Engels says that the political economy of the capitalist class "is almost entirely confined to the study of the rise and development of the capitalist pattern of production. It proceeds from the criticism of the remnants of the feudal form of production and exchange to prove the inevitability of their being replaced by the capitalist form...giving evidence all the more that the capitalist form of production and exchange will become an intolerable shackle of production."

To sum up, according to Engels, political economy in the broad sense as a science for the study of the conditions and forms for carrying out production, exchange and distribution, is a science for the study of the laws relating to the relations of production at the various stages of development of human society. Marx and Engels were the originators of this political economy in the broad sense. They have scientifically analyzed the capitalist form of production, explained the economic laws governing its rise, development and extinction, comprehensively studied the various pre-capitalist social patterns and forecast the special characteristics of the development of the two stages of a Communist society.

Lenin has made a significant contribution to Marxist political economy and has further substantiated its principles. Because he lived in an imperialist age, he made a scientific study of the general crisis of capitalism and initiated his theories on imperialism.

As we are aware, production is the synthesis of productive forces and the relations of production, and society is the course of the rise, development and resolution of contradictions between the superstructure and the economic foundation. The capitalist and imperialist relations of production obstruct the advancement of productive forces, and capitalist dictatorship and capitalist superstructure support the decadent relations of production. Without destroying the capitalist dictatorship, it is impossible to transform the capitalist and imperialist relations of production and accelerate the development of society's productive forces. By seizing political power, altering the old relations of production and establishing Socialist productive forces, the proletariat will be able to open up a broad avenue for the development of productive forces, and the political power secured by the proletariat and the Socialist superstructure will also become a great force for the development of productive forces.

We have explored above the substance of political economy as a science for the study of the laws relating to the relations of production and analyzed the "theoretical basis" found by Mr. P'ing-hsin in "Anti-Duehring" to support his contention which was nothing more than a distortion of the real meaning of a classical work. By regarding "the laws relating to the structure and movement of productive forces" as a subject of study for political economy, Mr. P'ing-hsin has not only committed a theoretical error, but done harm to the prosecution of revolution. His contention has a negative influence on the work of proletarian revolution and would convert its objective from that of overthrowing capitalist imperialism into that of engaging in a struggle for production.

1004 END