

Socialist Construction and Class Struggle In the Field of Economics

— Critique of Sun Yeh-fang's revisionist economic theory

by the Writing Group of the Kirin Provincial Revolutionary Committee

THE struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines on China's economic front is deepening. Using our great leader Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line for socialist construction to criticize the counter-revolutionary revisionist line of the renegade, hidden traitor and scab Liu Shao-chi is a motive force pushing the new upsurge in China's socialist construction forward along the course of Mao Tsetung Thought, and an important measure for attacking the handful of class enemies who try to sabotage socialist ownership and for consolidating and developing the socialist economic base.

The counter-revolutionary Sun Yeh-fang, former director of the Institute of Economics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, was a representative of Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line in the field of economics.

He wanted to transplant to China all of Khrushchov's methods for restoring a capitalist economy, and to devise a revisionist "system of political economy" which would provide a "theoretical" basis for Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line, so as to undermine socialist construction and subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat. Today as we criticize the revisionist economic theory and eliminate Liu Shao-chi's pernicious influence, Sun Yeh-fang and his revisionist "economics" are excellent teaching materials by negative example. By criticizing them, we can plant the great red banner of Mao Tsetung Thought more firmly on all positions in the economic field.

A Prescription of "Running the Economy by Economic Methods"

In his attempt to restore capitalism, the renegade, hidden traitor and scab Liu Shao-chi for a long time did his utmost to oppose Chairman Mao's great teaching "Political work is the life-blood of all economic work" in the course of socialist construction. He touted for "running the economy by economic methods," raved that "our country also runs factories to make profits, otherwise we wouldn't run them," and urged "do what-

ever brings profit." Sun Yeh-fang gleefully echoed this: "I give all this, which raises a profound question, my greatest support. I have always advocated running the economy by economic methods."

There was an international background to the "economics" that Sun Yeh-fang came up with. After the Khrushchov renegade clique threw open the flood gates of modern revisionism in 1956, Sun Yeh-fang went there several times to "pay homage" and acquired "supreme enlightenment." Apart from writing a number of articles and making many reports, he also concocted a series of "restricted research reports." He shamelessly declared that his "basic views" were merely copied from the modern revisionists. When the scholar hireling of social-imperialism Liberman popped up in 1962 with his big poisonous weed *Plan, Profit, Bonuses*, which has as its essence "putting profits in command," Sun Yeh-fang shouted for joy: "I'll take risks," "fight desperately" and "be more thorough than Liberman."

What "basic views" did Sun Yeh-fang pinch from modern revisionism?

1. He preached that economic plans should have profits as their basis. He uttered such absurdities as: "There may be thousands of laws, but the law of value comes first"; and "planning is based on the law of value."

2. He proclaimed profits as the objective, declaring: "I have doubts about the statement that 'capitalist society produces for profits, but socialist society produces for use value, not for profits'"; and "we raise labour productivity and technical standards for the purpose of obtaining profits."

3. He alleged that profits were the motive force and profits "can push business management forward"; "once you get hold of profits, you are leading an ox by its nose and its legs (other quotas) naturally go after. Otherwise, you will be carrying the legs."

4. He claimed that profits were the hinge. He proposed: "Let profits be the main quota in planning and statistics," and "in its relations with enterprises,

the state only has to get a grip on value quotas (profit quotas); it shouldn't bother with anything else but leave it to the enterprises."

5. He yelled that profits were the sole index for judging whether an enterprise was being run well or poorly. He said: "The amount of profit should be the most sensitive index for an enterprise's technical progress and the effectiveness of its management." He also babbled: "Socialist economy must have the profit rate on invested funds and the production price," "the average social profit rate on invested funds is the level that every enterprise must attain; those surpassing it are advanced enterprises and those falling short are the backward ones."

In a word, to Sun Yeh-fang, the purpose of planning and developing the economy is making money and factories and enterprises are set up and operated for that purpose. By getting hold of the "ox's nose" or profits, revolving around them and going after them, the enterprise can develop, techniques can be advanced and society can go forward. Though Sun Yeh-fang's "economics" sounds mysterious, it turns out to be nothing but a fraud once it is seen through.

The basic characteristic of capitalist society is that everything is done in order to make money — "do whatever brings profit." Marx pointed out that the mission of bourgeois society was to make money, and "production of surplus-value is the absolute law of this mode of production." Making money propels everything, money means vitality and the more one makes, the more vitality one gets; exploiting, plundering and waging wars of aggression in order to make money, this is the nature of the bourgeoisie. Engels said: "For it [the bourgeoisie] nothing exists in this world, except for the sake of money, itself not excluded. It knows no bliss save that of rapid gain." Sun Yeh-fang's "system of political economy" was devised from this bourgeois world outlook.

Regarding the money incentive as the panacea and something absolutely indispensable — this reflects the rotten and declining mental world of the modern revisionists, China's Khrushchov Liu Shao-chi and his henchman Sun Yeh-fang as well as the poverty of their economics.

After the proletariat seizes political power, there are two diametrically opposed lines for economic construction: Should politics be put in command of the economy or should "economic methods be used to run the economy"; should proletarian politics be put in command consistently or should "profits be in command"? In guiding our socialist construction, Chairman Mao has always put proletarian politics in first place, using politics to command the economy, and grasping revolution and promoting production. This is the Marxist-Leninist line for consolidating and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat. From Khrushchov in the Soviet Union to China's Khrushchov Liu Shao-chi, from Liberman to Sun Yeh-fang, all

advocated "running the economy by economic methods" and putting "profits in command." This in fact means putting bourgeois politics in command and using it to undermine the socialist economic base. This is an out-and-out counter-revolutionary revisionist line to restore capitalism.

Though he called his "economics" "socialist," Sun Yeh-fang could not disguise the reactionary essence of his theory of "putting profits in command": "Profits in command" was counterposed to putting proletarian politics in command in an effort to transform the unified socialist ownership by the whole people into separate "independent kingdoms" and turn every enterprise under ownership by the whole people into one under ownership by the bourgeoisie. In his own counter-revolutionary words, he wanted "this sacred garden of inner relations under the ownership by the whole people" to be "wide open." We shall now expose this reactionary essence from various aspects.

Socialist Planned Economy Versus Capitalist Free Economy

Our great leader Chairman Mao teaches us: "Man has been developing for hundreds of thousands of years, but in China it is only now that he has secured conditions under which he can develop his economy and culture according to plan. Now that we have these conditions, the face of our country will change from year to year."

The planned and proportionate development of the national economy is characteristic of socialism and is an important indication of socialism's superiority over capitalism. By first undermining the planned economy, Sun Yeh-fang tried to disintegrate unified socialist ownership by the whole people.

His "basic views" on the question of planning are: "Let profits be the main quota in planning and statistics," and "planning is based on the law of value." What does all this mean? It means that in making plans the state and the enterprises should all proceed from "value" and "profit." To put it more plainly, it means proceeding from making money, or, as Liu Shao-chi put it, "do whatever brings profit." The state works out a big plan for making money, while the enterprises formulate plans of a smaller nature for making money.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought holds that politics is the concentrated expression of economics, and that planning is subject to politics. There are socialist plans as well as revisionist "plans." The fundamental difference between them is: on which class' politics are the plans based and which class do they serve?

Ours is a socialist country under the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the basis of poverty and blankness and through decades of arduous struggle we are going to build a great and powerful socialist country with a

modern agriculture, modern industry, modern national defence and modern science and culture, and create a solid base area for the world revolution of the proletariat. Our national economic planning must serve this great political goal of the proletariat and should proceed from the needs of the domestic and international class struggles and our country's socialist construction in each period. In working out plans, we must adhere to the general line of **"going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism"** and the series of great principles, including **"Be prepared against war, be prepared against natural disasters, and do everything for the people,"** **"maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts,"** and **"take agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor,"** laid down by Chairman Mao. The requirements of preparedness against war and natural disasters and of doing everything for the people are our basic starting point in working out plans, doing work and considering problems. Confronted by the threat of a war of aggression launched by U.S. imperialism and social-imperialism, it is of special importance now to fully implement Chairman Mao's great principle **"Be prepared against war, be prepared against natural disasters, and do everything for the people."**

If "planning is based on the law of value," the state could not develop the unprofitable national defence industry; heavy industry or industries in the interior could not be built; a given area, province or city could not set up a diversified industrial system with a view to getting prepared against war; industries supporting agriculture but yielding low output value and bringing temporarily low returns could not be developed and the state could not engage in and increase those people's daily necessities which must be subsidized for a time; and it would be impossible to produce the goods necessary to support the struggle of the world's revolutionary people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. In short, what Sun Yeh-fang advocated would make us abandon our great task of building a powerful socialist country and depart from the victorious road charted by Chairman Mao. Such "plans" are nothing but revisionist plans needed by Liu Shao-chi for capitalist restoration. These are simply plans to drag us back over to the old semi-feudal and semi-colonial road and undermine our Party and country.

In socialist society, there are commodities and there is the law of value. We use the latter as a tool in planning and business accounting, but we are firmly opposed to making it the basis for regulating production or working out our plans. In their efforts to restore capitalism in the economic field, the modern revisionists share a common feature: they theoretically exaggerate the role of the law of value, and want to use it to regulate and control all social production. This is the way they try to pull economic construction out of the socialist orbit based on putting proletarian politics in

command and into the capitalist orbit based on "putting profits in command."

"Actually the law of value is another way of saying the general line," and "there may be thousands of laws, but the law of value comes first." By making such absurd statements, Sun Yeh-fang seemingly found justification for the trash he peddled, such as "planning is based on the law of value" and using the law of value to regulate all social production. This is the most shameless and despicable distortion of the Party's general line for socialist construction.

Planning on the basis of the law of value and planning in accordance with the general line represent two diametrically opposed lines in construction. The Party's general line for socialist construction formulated by Chairman Mao himself is the Marxist-Leninist line which mobilizes the enthusiasm of hundreds of millions of people for building socialism, the revolutionary line which competes in time and speed with imperialism and social-imperialism, and the life-blood that enables the proletariat to completely defeat the bourgeoisie and all class enemies. "Of thousands of things, Chairman Mao's revolutionary line comes first" is the conclusion drawn by the revolutionary masses from historical experience. Through his ridiculous statements, Sun Yeh-fang fully exposed his reactionary essence of being hostile to great Mao Tsetung Thought and his fierce countenance of trying to put the cause of socialist construction into the counter-revolutionary revisionist orbit.

Sun Yeh-fang attacked China's socialist planning, which is subordinate to proletarian politics, as "taking too much upon itself and exercising too rigid a control." He wanted the state to hand over more power to the enterprises. He insisted: "In its relations with enterprises, the state only has to get a grip on value quotas (profit quotas); it shouldn't bother with anything else but leave it to the enterprises."

What he meant by "anything else" is, first of all, that the proletarian state should not determine the political orientation of the enterprises, much less stipulate what they are to produce and how they are to distribute their products; and that enterprises would even "have a free hand in the buying or selling of fixed assets." Obviously he was demanding that enterprises divorce themselves from centralized and unified state leadership and declare their independence and autonomy.

In asserting that the state "only has to get a grip on the profit quotas" of enterprises, Sun Yeh-fang tried to fundamentally change the socialist relations between enterprises and the proletarian state, which subordinate the former to the latter, into the purely money relations characteristic of capitalism. The entity of socialist ownership by the whole people would thus be disintegrated and competition and anarchy in production would run rampant and socialist planned economy would become capitalist free economy. Such a change is precisely what Sun Yeh-fang worked day and night

to achieve. When he screamed that the system of planning "is inferior to the free economy," he exposed his diabolical ambitions.

Chairman Mao points out: **"Without a high degree of democracy it is impossible to have a high degree of centralism, and without a high degree of centralism it is impossible to establish a socialist economy."**

There is only one master of the multitudes of enterprises under socialist ownership by the whole people — the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat led by our Party. Only this state can represent the fundamental interests of the working class and the masses of labouring people and determine the principles and policies to be followed by enterprises, the orientation for their development, the production and distribution of their products and the disposal of their assets. In dealing with enterprises, the state practises democratic centralism, that is, centralized power on major issues and decentralized power on minor issues, centralized leadership and level-to-level administration. This is necessary for consolidating ownership by the whole people and for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Party Central Committee with Chairman Mao as its leader and Vice-Chairman Lin as its deputy leader is the sole centre of leadership of the entire Party, the entire army and the people of the entire country. Firm implementation of the national economic plan approved by the Party Central Committee is the fundamental guarantee for the high-speed development of socialist construction in our country.

Chairman Mao teaches us: **"In our economic and financial set-up, we must overcome such evils as disunity, assertion of independence and lack of co-ordination, and must establish a working system which is unified and responsive to direction and which permits the full application of our policies and regulations."** Every enterprise should foster the concept of considering the country as a whole, keep overall interests in mind, take a long and broad view and give priority to the overall interests. They should firmly and unwaveringly rally around the Party Central Committee with Chairman Mao as its leader and Vice-Chairman Lin as its deputy leader, attain **"unity in thinking, policy, plan, command and action"** on the basis of Mao Tsetung Thought, fulfil and overfulfil the state plan in an all-round way and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism.

Should Proletarian Politics or Profits Be Put in Command in Running Enterprises?

The line followed in managing enterprises after the establishment of socialist ownership by the whole people is a question of vital importance. It determines whether the proletariat can firmly hold leadership in the enterprises and whether the dictatorship of the proletariat can be consolidated. The bourgeoisie, which

is deprived of the means of production, invariably tries for a break-through in management in order to disintegrate ownership by the whole people and restore capitalism. Sun Yeh-fang's sensitivity as a counter-revolutionary led him to make a big to-do over this question.

He said: "The amount of profit should be the most sensitive index for an enterprise's technical progress and the effectiveness of its management" and profits "can push business management forward." This is simply looking at and running an enterprise from the capitalist viewpoint.

The capitalist's immediate aim in running an enterprise is to make the maximum profit with the minimum capital and, therefore, the amount of profit is the sole yardstick he uses in measuring the success of an enterprise.

Is it true that the capitalist method of "putting profits in command" can "push business management forward"? On the contrary, it only leads to worse and worse troubles. In managing enterprises, those whose minds are commanded by profits will substitute counter-revolutionary economism for the lofty ideal of doing everything for the revolution, freely change the direction of the enterprises, go all out to do whatever brings big profits, make little effort to do what brings small profits and refuse to undertake anything that cannot yield profits. They will use the capitalist method of intriguing one another and shifting difficulties on to others to replace communist co-ordination between enterprises. They will also use "material incentives" to corrupt people's souls and sap their revolutionary will, and change socialist relations within enterprises into employment relations of a pecuniary nature. In short, the more an enterprise goes in for "putting profits in command," the more it departs from the socialist direction; it will degenerate and the proletarian position will be turned into a revisionist pillar. This is an objective law of class struggle independent of man's will.

"Living instances" of profits "pushing business management forward" are supplied by countries where modern revisionism rules. There, monsters of every sort collaborate: capitalist roaders, capitalists, speculators, illegal contractors, new kulaks, grafters, swindlers and embezzlers. From production to distribution and from economic branches to government organizations, the forces of capitalism run wild in town and countryside. Speculation, cornering the market, price rigging and cheating are the order of the day; capitalist roaders in enterprises and government team up in grafting, embezzling, working for their own benefit at the expense of the public interest, dividing up the spoils and taking bribes. Socialist ownership by the whole people has degenerated into ownership by a privileged stratum, and is directly manipulated by a handful of capitalist roaders and new bourgeois elements. The national economy is in a state of utter chaos, the labour-

ing people are again in dire straits and the fruits of socialism won by the proletariat at the cost of their blood have been forfeited. This has been a painful historical lesson!

"Historical experience merits attention." "Putting profits in command" absolutely cannot "push business management forward," as Sun Yeh-fang alleged, but it does push the enterprises to "move" against the socialist current and in essence abolishes socialist ownership by the whole people while keeping it only in name.

A socialist enterprise is where the three great revolutionary movements — class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment — are carried out. In judging an enterprise, the proletariat first examines it by the political criteria, that is, it sees whether the enterprise holds high the great red banner of Mao Tsetung Thought, whether power is in the hands of true Marxists, whether it conscientiously implements Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, principles and policies, whether it helps revolutionize people's thinking and trains and brings up an army of revolutionized industrial workers, and whether it proceeds from its specific work while taking the whole into consideration and fulfils in an all-round way the production tasks assigned by the Party and the state with greater, faster, better and more economical results, thereby contributing to socialism.

We do not depend on "putting profits in command" or "material incentives" in running an enterprise; we depend on putting proletarian politics in command and on the proletariat's fundamental programme for running enterprises — the great **Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company**.

Chairman Mao teaches: **"Management is also socialist education."** The proletariat pays attention in management of an enterprise, first of all, to politics, the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines, and revolutionizing the leading group's thinking. It educates the workers, cadres and technical personnel in Mao Tsetung Thought and turns the enterprise into a great red school of Mao Tsetung Thought. It has to conscientiously get a good grasp of management in production, planning, technique, finance and labour; but a good job can be done in management only by giving prominence to proletarian politics, mobilizing the masses, learning to do ideological and political work and doing things in accordance with the Party's policies.

Chairman Mao teaches us: **"Ideological work and political work are the guarantee for accomplishing economic work and technical work; and they serve the economic base. Moreover, ideology and politics are the commander, the soul in everything. If our ideological work and political work slacken even a little, the economic work and technical work will inevitably go astray."** Only by putting proletarian politics to the fore, undertaking the mass movement for the living

study and application of Mao Tsetung Thought and revolutionizing people's thinking can the correct political orientation be maintained, soaring revolutionary enthusiasm stimulated and the potential initiative and creativeness of the masses for socialism erupt like a volcano, thereby giving a powerful impetus to production. This is the fundamental line we must adhere to at all times.

Initiated and led by Chairman Mao himself, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has cleared away every obstacle on the road for the proletariat to run industrial enterprises and all other economic undertakings. The great **Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company**, long blockaded by Liu Shao-chi and his gang, is now being directly grasped by the revolutionary masses, and has displayed and is displaying enormous strength beyond estimation. Guided by the tremendous force of Mao Tsetung Thought brought on by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, many enterprises with "long standing, big and difficult problems" and once seriously poisoned by "putting profits in command" and "material incentives," have leapt forward and become vigorous, advanced enterprises. Unsolved for a long time under the rule of capitalist roaders who tried to tackle them by "putting profits in command" and "material incentives," many difficult technical problems have been successively solved by the heroic working class which "keeps Chairman Mao in mind." Tens of thousands of enterprises are going forward and becoming better and better along the road of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and making bigger and bigger contributions to socialism. By always persevering in putting proletarian politics in command, strengthening business management and working meticulously, we will certainly be able to win even more brilliant victories.

Drawing a Clear Line Between Increasing Production And Practising Economy and "Putting Profits in Command"

Chairman Mao has taught us: **"Corruption and waste are very great crimes."** **"A socialist economic enterprise must do its utmost to make full use of manpower and equipment, improve the organization of labour, improve management, raise labour productivity and use manpower and materials economically, and must launch emulation drives and practise economic accounting, so as to reduce production costs and increase personal income and public accumulation year by year."**

The statement that "calculating the cost of production means putting profits in command" is a muddled viewpoint, to say the least. The essence of "putting profits in command" lies in opposing putting proletarian politics in command and in restoring capitalism. This is what we firmly oppose. We must unswervingly persevere in putting proletarian politics in command. However, giving prominence to proletarian politics

should never be taken as not doing economic work, adopting business accounting, lowering production costs and increasing accumulation. If it is thus erroneously understood, we shall be taken in by the class enemy's tricks. Profits of enterprises constitute an important source of socialist state revenue. In our budgetary state revenue, about 90 per cent comes from payments (profits, taxes, etc.) by the state sector of the economy. If the enterprises fail to completely fulfil their payments plans for profits and taxes on time or even sustain unnecessary losses, this will affect state revenue and planned socialist construction. In business management, we must give prominence to proletarian politics, mobilize the worker masses to vigorously grasp revolution and promote production, and unfold the movement to increase production and practise economy in a down-to-earth way, **"saving every copper for the war effort, for the revolutionary cause and for our economic construction."** We are opposed to the phenomenon of not paying serious attention to production and financial management and the erroneous tendency of indifference to state property and indulging in extravagance and waste on the pretext that "no matter how much we spend, the benefit is there." We should foster the new socialist mode of "regarding economy as honourable and waste as shameful," handle finance and wield financial power for the revolution and accumulate more and more funds for the state so as to speed up socialist construction.

Exposing a "Secret"

Chairman Mao teaches us: **"The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line."** Sun Yeh-fang's reactionary economics adopted this commonly used revisionist trick.

His reactionary economics started with seeking "the common characteristics" of capitalism and socialism. With ulterior motives he said: "While negating the specific laws of capitalist economy in socialist society, we have denied all the general and common characteristics of economic laws. . . ." After racking his brains, Sun Yeh-fang found that value and the law of value were the "common characteristics," and on this basis he built his "system of political economy" which has as its core "putting profits in command."

Sun Yeh-fang boasted of having discovered "the secret of all economic questions." He said: "Man differs from animals in that animals live on nature's bounty, but man lives by his own labour and by conquering nature. Whether people lead a good or bad life depends on their labour efficiency, or, in other

words, on the degree to which man conquers nature. Therefore, the secret of all economic questions lies in how to produce more with less labour." "The secret of developing production lies in how to reduce the average social necessary labour."

So, here lies the difference between man and animals, but in this respect there is no class difference between man and man. All the blood suckers — the slave owners, landlords and capitalists — become people who "live by their own labour." Sun Yeh-fang wrote off in one stroke the class antagonisms of thousands of years and the history of the working people soaked in blood and tears. By saying "producing more with less labour," he negated the fundamental difference in "all economic" systems of human society and regarded the systems of exploitation on the one hand and of socialism and communism on the other as the same. Sun Yeh-fang turned history completely upside down.

"Man conquers nature" according to specific modes of production, and in a class society this is done on the basis of definite class relations. It is sheer deception to say that whether people "lead a good or bad life" is determined by their "labour efficiency"! In all societies dominated by the exploiting classes, the determining factor is the amount of slaves, land or capital they own, while the labouring people, the peasants and the workers, lead a life of utter misery. Chairman Mao points out: **"True, the United States has science and technology. But unfortunately they are in the grip of the capitalists, not in the hands of the people, and are used to exploit and oppress the people at home and to perpetrate aggression and to slaughter people abroad."** This is true in imperialist countries and in the social-imperialist country today. There, the "labour efficiency" created by science and technology can only mean heavier exploitation of the people, and cannot reduce their burdens of life a bit. The labouring people can build a new life only by overthrowing the reactionary rule and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The secret of capitalist economy is definitely not "producing more with less labour," but maximum exploitation of the labour of the workers. When it comes to labour, capitalist society is least economical; it economizes only on capital. And for the capitalists, getting maximum profits with minimum capital means "business acumen."

Only socialist society is most economical as regards labour. It is an important principle of socialism to economize on manpower, materials and funds in producing more and better products to meet the needs of society. However, classes and class struggle exist in socialist society and whether the proletariat or the bourgeoisie wins out remains a question for a long time. Because of this, it is necessary to proceed from the

basic fact of class struggle in understanding and dealing with all economic questions. The role of socialist political economy should be that of expounding in the light of class struggle the objective laws governing the relations between production and the productive forces as well as between the economic base and the superstructure. **"Grasp revolution, promote production,"** as put forward by Chairman Mao, is a great Marxist-Leninist truth which expounds such laws. Vice-Chairman Lin points out: **"'Grasp revolution, promote production' — this principle is entirely correct. It correctly explains the relationship between revolution and production, between consciousness and matter, between the superstructure and the economic base and between the relations of production and the productive forces."** The understanding and grasping of this great truth means finding the basic way to promote the rapid development of socialist construction. Glib talk about "producing more with less labour" separated from class struggle means benumbing the revolutionary will of the people and serving the restoration of capitalism. If the proletariat does not defeat the bourgeoisie, it will be working for the bourgeoisie by "producing more with less labour." But Sun Yeh-fang described this so-called "more — less" formula as "the secret of all economic questions." He even went further in saying that "the red line running through the works of socialist political economy should be to produce in a planned way the maximum amount of products to satisfy the social needs with the minimum consumption of social labour." This is how he concealed the class struggle in the socialist society and tried to oppose the red line of great Mao Tsetung Thought and tamper with the proletarian political economy with his sinister line.

In dealing with revisionism, Lenin said: **"The content . . . did not have to grow and take shape, it was transferred bodily from bourgeois to socialist literature."** Sun Yeh-fang's "secret" in denying classes and class struggle was not his new discovery, but something picked up from the bourgeoisie's rag pile. The Frenchman Jean Baptiste Say, the father of vulgar capitalist economics, tried to prove in his writings that "man" lived entirely by his own labour. He said: "The labour of the entrepreneur or factory owner is productive, although he performs no actual manual work." Moreover, capitalists' labour is a "superior kind of labour"! When Sun Yeh-fang said: "Man lives by his own labour," he was singing the same tune as Jean Baptiste Say! Say declared: "Make less labour the requisite for producing the same amount of produce, or, what comes to exactly the same thing, get a larger amount of produce from the same amount of human labour. — And this is the grand object and the acme of industry." Thus we see that Say also used the same "more — less" formula. What Sun Yeh-fang reveals as "the secret of all economic questions" in effect is "the

grand object and the acme of industry" in Say's *A Treatise on Political Economy*. After Sun Yeh-fang came up with the theory of "putting profits in command," he had to devote a lot of thought to fabricate his "essential difference" between the "profits" he advocated and capitalist profits. Though he covered his face, he still showed his true colours. His theoretical basis of "putting profits in command" was all copied from the defender of the bourgeoisie Say and his like.

When the mask is removed, the ferocious ghost is revealed. The essence of Sun Yeh-fang's "secret" is to negate the fundamental difference between socialism and capitalism, hide all sorts of capitalist rubbish behind the so-called "common characteristics" and label them socialist "precious things" and thrust them into socialist society. For instance, "putting profits in command" is clearly a special feature of capitalism, but he alleged that profit was "the central link which leads everything forward" in the socialist economy. Average profit is obviously the regulator in capitalist free competition, but he insisted that it was the basis for determining the direction of development in socialist national economy. Production price is undoubtedly what exists under the capitalist system, but he deliberately described it as the "tool for economic comparison" in socialist production. Using such "secret" methods, Sun Yeh-fang attempted to drag people on to the evil capitalist road. Doesn't this clearly show his counter-revolutionary criminal aim?

The "economics" that Sun Yeh-fang concocted under the pretext of opposing "traditional dogmatism" urged people to seek profits, not to make revolution and to give up power for the sake of money. His "economics" was ardently welcomed by those capitalist roaders who wanted the restoration of capitalism, grafters, embezzlers and bourgeois elements undermining socialism. His "economics" is out-and-out economics for capitalist restoration. An important part of revolutionary mass criticism is the thorough criticism of the revisionist economic theory, centred on the theory of "putting profits in command"; this is an important task in the struggle-criticism-transformation on the economic front. Wherever the standard of the bourgeoisie and revisionism flies, we will haul it down and raise the banner of the proletariat.

Let us hold aloft the great red banner of Mao Tsetung Thought and carry through to the end the socialist revolution on the economic front along the course charted by Chairman Mao. In the spirit of **"seize the day, seize the hour,"** we will strengthen preparedness against war, accelerate the pace of socialist construction, and forge ahead victoriously in the world-shaking storms of revolution!

(Originally published in "Hongqi," No. 2, 1970.)