

FOR N.C. INFORMATION:

Los Angeles, California  
May 13, 1967

PARTY POLICY ON THE CHINESE REVOLUTION  
AND IN THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

By Arne Swabeck

To the National Committee Plenum, June 2,3,4, 1967:

The IEC of our co-thinkers' organization has now decided to open discussion in the world Trotskyist movement as a whole on the important and complex question of China and its cultural revolution. This is a welcome development, and it is timely. It indicates that in the minds of the IEC members complete clarity or a finally settled conviction on the real essence of the Chinese revolution does not yet exist, and that some lessons may still be learned from it. If this were not so, there would be no point to open a discussion.

Our party leaders have consistently manifested a contrary attitude. Whenever I have submitted my views on China for consideration by the National Committee, it has been accepted only "with the understanding that this is not to be misconstrued as a decision to reopen discussion on the Chinese question in the party or the National Committee." Obviously the party leaders fear any discussion on China. They find it much more to their liking to hurl the most loathsome abuses and invectives at Mao Tse-tung and his associates.

Just at the time when the early events of the Chinese socialist cultural revolution shook the world the youth held a national convention. But they managed without giving this important development any attention whatever. The only contribution on this subject came from the Milwaukee delegate, and he was expelled.

A prominent feature of these events were the demonstrations of the many millions of Chinese youth whose revolutionary slogans reverberated throughout the world. In the socialist cultural revolution the youthful Red Guards are out in front and they are carrying their message throughout the country, even to the remotest villages. But they were greeted with derision and vilification by all the media of communication here and elsewhere, including the party press. Writing from China, Anna Louise Strong replied to the vilifiers: "In almost every land adolescents lead the crime waves; in China, they lead the crusade for a more confident socialism, a more perfect society." Yet, the emergence of the Red Guards and the significant role they play in the continuing and triumphantly advancing Chinese revolution, was given no attention whatever in the youth convention discussion.

What is the reason for this dismal failure to consider and to study revolutionary developments which at this particular period overshadow all others? Comrade Alvin complains that the youth has become a mere carbon copy of the party, the only difference being that of age limit on membership. I think the truth of this complaint extends much farther than he realizes. The youth organization imitates its elders in methods, actions, political outlook and organizational practices, even including the phony and ridiculous antics of the Control Commission. The failure of these young people to study important world revolutionary developments reflects the failure of their elders. It is a product of the political and theoretical mis-education they have received from their elders in the party leadership.

To study and assimilate the lessons of revolutions has always been considered a prime prerequisite for Marxist education. We need only remind ourselves how carefully Marx analyzed the Paris Commune which he called "that sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind . . . the glorious harbinger of a new society." Marx examined most thoroughly its proletarian character, its strength and its weaknesses as well as its lessons from which he drew the major conclusion: "But the working class cannot simply lay hold on the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes."

We surely do remember how dilligently and painstakingly Trotsky taught us the lessons of the Russian revolution, both its triumph and its degeneration. Trotsky did this not only in his formal history of the revolution but throughout our important political and theoretical disputes, in which he participated to the end of his life.

During the younger and healthier period of our movement we followed Trotsky's teaching as we attempted to assimilate the great lessons of the Russian revolution.

What is the situation now? Among the revolutions that have occurred since the second world war the party has given extensive attention and unflagging support to the Cuban revolution, while attempting to assimilate some of its lessons. But the study of these lessons has been rather superficial, even though it includes something called "Theory of the Cuban Revolution." Serious gaps in this study still remain.

Our attitude to the Chinese revolution presents an entirely different case. The basic position maintained by the party majority leaders cannot at all be interpreted as genuine support to the Chinese revolution against imperialist attacks; quite the contrary. Statements and articles appearing in the party press display the same intransigent and bitter hostility to the leaders of the Chinese revolution as did the social democrats to the Bolsheviks. Formulas about Stalinism appropriate to the degeneracy of the Soviet state have been constantly utilized to describe the Chinese developments. The reality of these developments show a revolution, not degenerating, but progressing by giant strides and maturing.

Just now the Chinese revolution is advancing triumphantly to new and higher social and cultural levels. But the party leaders still adhere stubbornly to a course that defies reality and is bound to end disastrously. Their basic policy is still aimed at the overthrow of the Mao Tse-tung regime; and this at a time when virtually the entire radical milieu throughout the world -- outside of the Moscow oriented parties -- recognize that the only force ready to follow this policy would be those of the bourgeois inspired counterrevolution.

The fundamentally false party position on China is not an isolated phenomenon, or a mere case of an episodically mistaken viewpoint. It interlinks with the general reformist inspired and opportunist attitude, outlook and practice that has now become predominant in leading party circles. This is reflected most clearly in the policy pursued in the antiwar movement.

The mighty turnout for the April 15th demonstrations has brought this movement to new heights of mass struggle and mass participation in the political life of the country. After this, America will never be the same again. The working class has begun to enter actively into this movement. Viewed in connection with the increasing union rank and file restlessness, this beginning opens the path to a new stage of developments. It is a harbinger of things to come.

Unquestionably the party and the youth performed well in the organizational aspect of building up the April 15th demonstrations. But saying this is telling only half of the story. Other organizations took a similarly active part, and from the very beginning of the movement. More decisive therefore is the question: What political function has the party performed? This is the question that needs to be examined. The fact that the working class has now begun to enter the movement invests this question with extraordinary importance.

The primary duty of a revolutionary party, when participating in a mass movement of this character, should be to provide a leverage of revolutionary thought and action. But the sad fact is that the SWP leadership never accepted this obligation. Its departure from fundamental Marxist principles in its attitude toward revolutionary China had a logical corollary in the outright pacifist and reformist inspired policy and practice in the antiwar movement.

More than a year ago I addressed to the February 11, 12, and 13, 1966 plenum a proposal that the party base its antiwar policy on the Leninist conception of revolutionary defeatism. That would mean to favor the victory of the National Liberation Front; to say so publicly and declare that its struggle is just. Lenin considered the policy of revolutionary defeatism entirely justified in regard to the Czarist armies. Can anyone deny that it is many times more justified in the case of the American imperialist assault on Vietnam?

Lenin said that the policy of defeatism is the logical conclusion from the class relationships of imperialist wars. He insisted on the necessity of this policy as a means of preserving the revolutionary quality of the party. Trotsky taught us that "the renunciation of defeatism under the condition of imperialist war is tantamount to the rejection of the socialist revolution." And yet, this is precisely the position of the party leadership. It never accepted, much less practiced, the policy of revolutionary defeatism.

To the February plenum I also proposed that the party adopt a policy of fighting the draft and give active support to all draft resisters. This policy should be applied regardless of the form of resistance, whether refusal to go to Vietnam, refusal to serve in the army, or burning of draft cards. Naturally we are opposed to diverting the struggle against war to lobbying the Congress for draft law changes.

In my proposal to the February plenum I acknowledged that regarding inter-imperialist wars of the past we have held the position of not resisting service in the armed forces but rather prove ourselves as good soldiers alongside of our buddies as a means to prepare a more favorable reception for our ideas.

Vietnam, however, presents an entirely different situation. There American imperialism is engaged in a counterrevolutionary action; it is attempting to crush the Vietnam revolution and establish a military base from which to move against the Chinese revolution. Under no condition can the party hold to the view that members should be good soldiers of the counterrevolutionary forces. That would mean to shoot to kill National Liberation Front fighters who are our comrades. The party must support the draft resistance; that is what a revolutionary policy demands.

The anti-draft sentiment is widespread. Even though direct resistance has not yet become a broad mass movement, the party can fail to give it active support only by renouncing its revolutionary duty. Nevertheless, this is precisely the stand taken by the party leaders. Outside of support of the Fort Hood Three, they have failed on this vital aspect of opposition to the imperialist war; an aspect that is an inseparable part of revolutionary defeatism.

Others, notably Carmichael, the PLP, the SDS and even Muhammad Ali are out in front fighting the draft. Apparently motivated by a devout longing for respectability the party leaders have placed the SWP in the unenviable position of acting as a conservative barrier against this indispensable fight. But this will not be acceptable to the youth who face the draft; much less will it be acceptable to the black proletariat in the ghetto. They will seek a solution elsewhere.

Concerning relations between the antiwar movement and the civil rights struggle the role of the party leadership has been no less dismal, obtuse and devoid of revolutionary initiative. At the February plenum I proposed a policy that would seek to link the aims of both movements into one integrated struggle. I argued then that the system that promotes the assault on Vietnam and the invasion of Santa Domingo is the same system that commits murder and oppression of the Negro people. The Seattle branch emphasized the same question. It got the brush-off. As far as policy in the antiwar movement is concerned, the party leadership remained insensitive to this vital question.

Now Carmichael, Martin Luther King and their associates have taken the step of linking the aims of the black liberation movement intimately to those of the antiwar movement -- a task which would have been accepted by those who claim to be Marxists. All the party can do now in this decisive area is to be tailending.

Let there be no mistake, however, the linking of the aims of these movements into one integrated struggle, and the resistance to the draft, is precisely what the American imperialist rulers are profoundly fearful of. It calls forth their greatest hatred and their most violent outcry.

The central axis of party policy in the antiwar movement is the single issue of Withdrawal of American Troops from Vietnam Now. This is an excellent demand, of course. But the party leaders have stubbornly insisted that this be the only issue. It ignores entirely the issues of the class struggle that are insolubly bound up with the war. And the leaders are caught in the trap of the single issue which prevents the party from functioning as a leverage for revolutionary thought and action.

To be caught in this trap is so much more ominous at the present stage when workers from trade unions are entering the antiwar movement. What this means is already clearly indicated. The report from the Chicago Trade Union Conference states that "the discussion rapidly got into trade union problems as connected with the war -- threats against the right to strike, higher taxes, lack of social welfare funds, the draft hitting sons of unionists, Meany's racism and the racist character of the war." In other words, when considering their opposition to the war, the workers immediately raised the issues of the class struggle. These are the concrete signals which the party leaders failed to read correctly.

A better reading of these signals came from four young comrades from Boston. In the youth pre-convention discussion they demanded "a clear line of demarcation between the program of the reformists and that of the revolutionaries for the antiwar movement, and their respective approaches to a United Front." They want to "make a break from the tailending of the past year. . . . The united front," say these young comrades,

"is not a partnership with the reformists but a form of struggle against them. We must not rely on them but mistrust them. Our task is to win over the antiwar militants from the influence of the pacifists and reformists to conscious anti-imperialism." This seems to be a lesson the party leaders still have to learn. In fact, the whole party could benefit from a thorough study of the Leninist concept of the united front.

A clear line of demarcation between the program of reformism and that of revolutionary Marxism -- that is the real issue. It is so much more important in view of the well known fact that the vanguard elements in the antiwar movement and in the New Left are groping for fundamental solutions to the many pressing social problems. But to draw that clear line of demarcation, or to be more exact, to function as a revolutionary instrument of the working class would necessitate a return to the Marxist basis upon which the party was founded. This would include the recognition that the fight against the imperialist war is inseparable from the struggle against capitalism. Only by readopting a policy that is solidly anchored in the class struggle and seeks to merge it with the colonial revolution in common struggle against imperialism, can the party carry out its revolutionary duty in the antiwar movement. The same goes for the necessary opposition to coalition politics. Marxists have always regarded the counterposing of revolutionary ideas and concepts as the only correct and effective way to fight against all reformist nostrums.

Incidentally, that would also provide the most fruitful assistance to the many young people who are groping for fundamental solutions to the most pressing problems of capitalist society. In turn, the latter would be attracted to the party that provides the revolutionary solution.

In the school of Marxism we have learned that the revolutionary quality of a working class party is not established once and for all; it must be submitted to constant test and verification. If the revolutionary quality is to endure, it will need constant renewal. And only through the application of Marxist analysis to the study of the great world events, combined with the practical experience in the class struggle, can political and theoretical clarity and firmness be maintained.

The party has faced a test in the antiwar movement and it has been found wanting. It lacked the fundamental prerequisite -- a revolutionary policy. Without this prerequisite the party cannot be expected to lead the American revolution. It becomes incapable of leading the struggle for socialism.

The party's revolutionary origin cannot be disputed. Under Trotsky's guidance we learned to honor and uphold the principles of the class struggle and fundamental proletarian internationalist principles. For quite a few years, however, the party has been pretty well isolated from the working class

which has been relatively quiescent. The absence of its correcting influence laid the party open to the corrosive effect of the capitalist environment and the conservative encrustation that this tended to produce.

The result of this effect was indicated most sharply in the reaction of the party leaders to the Kennedy assassination, and their treatment of it. That treatment was worthy of liberals or social democrats, not revolutionary Marxists. But one unacknowledged and uncorrected error leads inevitably to others; for it has now been repeated by the failure to maintain a revolutionary policy in the struggle against the American imperialist assault on Vietnam.

Because of the inability of the party leaders to rise above the conservatizing effect of the capitalist environment on home grounds, it defaulted equally on its obligation to proletarian internationalist principles. It failed to adopt a revolutionary position in regard to the great and decisive world developments, as behooves conscious internationalists. Thus we see that in this case, as well as in all other manifestations of social and political life, the dialectical interaction has been inescapable.

Most outstanding among the great and decisive world developments certainly is the Chinese revolution. It has unfolded through its different stages from its early struggles, political and military, to create the revolutionary leadership, to build, harden and educate the cadre, engage in the victorious struggle for power and lay the foundation for the socialist system. As the revolution continued its uninterrupted advance to new and higher social, political and cultural levels, we are privileged to observe a mighty process immensely rich in lessons for Marxists -- that is, provided a Marxist analysis is applied to this process. But the truth is that the party leadership has not even to this date made a serious attempt to study the Chinese revolution in terms of the Marxist dialectical interpretation. The party membership is deprived of the benefit of these rich lessons. The party leaders simply do not understand the Chinese revolution.

To this dismal picture the British Trotskyists present a contrast, and in some ways a healthy contrast. They have been more fortunate, of course. They were enabled to develop their organization in a capitalist environment in which the working class over a number of years has been relatively militant and advancing on the Labor Party basis, while learning new lessons in reformist labor politics. This has served to feed the leftist tendencies with which the Socialist Labor League has been afflicted. Conservatism never did get a foothold.

Now the SLL has taken the first tentative step toward the recognition of the Chinese revolution. It includes the defense of China against imperialist attacks and critical support to the Red Guards and to Mao and his associates in the

struggle against those who are accused of taking the capitalist road. This tentative step is not without certain faults of analysis. It is a healthy and welcome sign nevertheless; it points toward a more rational revolutionary attitude, the first sign of its kind among Trotskyist groups. I congratulate the SLL. I sincerely hope this will help elevate the "debate" between the SLL and the SWP to political levels and eliminate the gutter type of recriminations that have brought discredit to Trotskyism.

Meanwhile the efforts of party spokesmen to deal with China's cultural socialist revolution are reduced to parroting the bourgeois babblers who can see nothing else involved but a power struggle. Instead of enthusiasm and socialist inspiration for revolutionary achievements we are offered scorn.

The editor of World Outlook has carried this to the point of direct adaptation of the petty bourgeois type of intellectual disdain for people engaged in the more menial occupations. He tries to regale his readers with successive stories about the night soil collector who had the timidity to be concerned about the thought of Mao Tse-tung. Behind this lurks the idea that a night soil collector should know his place, stick to his menial task, and leave matters of social philosophy and political theory to the editors. Lenin had other ideas. He said that every cook should learn how to run the state.

Reading Fanshen we learn that the author, when living with the Chinese peasants, did not shrink from joining them and get his hands dirty carrying night soil from the privy to the fields before plowing. And he wrote a splendid book which, page after page, brings the living essence of the revolution and its marvelous lessons to the attentive reader. Perhaps the editor of World Outlook could improve his narrow intellectual vision by performing a similar stint of manual labor.

Confusing the issues of China's cultural revolution in order to blur their real essence, together with outright distortion of its development, are areas in which the editor has acquired considerable skill. For example, several issues of World Outlook have brought the information that Mao is opposed to a raise in the standard of living of the workers. The cultural revolution, as advanced by Mao, is opposed to it. Let's see what is behind this monstrous fable.

One of the most serious issues of conflict in the cultural revolution is that of material incentives versus moral, or socialist incentives as the driving force of production and labor productivity in the nascent socialist society. This vital issue has been widely debated among Marxists. In the SWP it has been given no attention at all.

The Mao Tse-tung leadership has observed with growing dismay the universal practice of using material incentives for



both managers and workers in the Soviet Union. It has become a system occupying the primary role in production. This system is now being further extended through the Liberman sponsored economic reform, in which profitability is made the central axis, not only as an index of enterprise efficiency, but also for productivity incentive and bonus payments.

Mao and his associates say that production for profit must inevitably strengthen the bourgeois type of personal acquisitive tendencies which are directly antagonistic to the collective system of nationalized and planned economy. Moral corruption, cynicism and disregard of principle flows logically from the practices of profit making. In turn, these consequences undermine the foundation of socialist development and obliquely introduce the seeds of capitalist restoration.

To stimulate rapid economic progress and greater technical competence of labor the Chinese rely chiefly on socialist consciousness. Giving first priority to material incentives in the Soviet Union serves in a subtle form as implicit, if not explicit, justification for the existence of bureaucratic privileges. The dependence in China on socialist incentives is an expression of the resistance against such privileges.

This is the truth of the situation distorted by the editor of World Outlook. Mao's opponents have sought to sponsor a system of material incentives for China, Mao has fought and continues to fight against it.

But in the art of distortion Comrade Novack is not going to be left behind. He presented "The Case of Chou Yang" (World Outlook, March 10, 1967), which he called "An Example of Maoist Double Dealing." His authority for this slander is Merle Goldman of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard University, who proves himself to be an obscurantist and a liar in the service of the American bourgeoisie.

Comrade Novack's story, based on Goldman's "research," centers around the case of some Chinese literary people. Nothing needs be said about the story for it is a complete fabrication. Had Novack been less eager about emulating the bourgeois pundit, he could have ascertained the truth by reading Mao's "Talks on Art and Literature" at the Yen-an Forum. (Selected Works, Vol. III)

However, this brings to mind the far more important question of how to study the lessons of proletarian revolutions. Let me cite one excellent example. When the Russian revolution shook the world those of us who were then in the Socialist Party left wing quickly became aware of the leading role played by Lenin and Trotsky, and we did not rest until we could learn just what these leaders had to say. In the case of the Chinese revolution the leading role of Mao Tse-tung is equally well known. Indeed, it is an undisputed fact, and certainly Mao is the greatest authority on the subject. Yet, our party

leaders disdain the very idea of studying Mao's works and assimilating its lessons. Long ago they had him pegged as just another Stalinist unworthy of any further attention. The result is: our party leaders never learned to understand the real essence of the Chinese revolution. They have become pure and simple purveyors of misinformation and miseducation.

A glaring example of this miseducation is Comrade Novack's treatment of "The Young Red Guards and Mao's 'Cultural Revolution'." It appeared in the Militant, October 17, 1966. Not only is this an example of miseducation; it is entirely contrary to the lessons we have learned from Trotsky.

Novack tells his readers -- and I quote at length -- "A thoroughgoing reconstruction of human relations, customs and habits, art and culture, is the logical sequel and eventual culmination of a profound popular revolution like that in China. However, this can only be the ripened achievement of a wholly renovated social order, based not only on new economic foundations but on an unprecedented flow of wealth, a reduction of compulsory labor, an end to state coercion, and harmonious human relations. This is the collective work of a succession of generations. It cannot be produced on command from above in obedience to the edict of an all-powerful individual. Such an arbitrary conception could only emanate from the heads of autocrats who travesty the aims of scientific socialism.

"In any case, such a profound transformation of life . . . cannot be accomplished amidst fierce social conflicts. The socialist cultural revolution in the Marxist, not Maoist sense, is not a weapon or phase in the class struggle." (My emphasis)

Let us see now what Trotsky had to say on the question of this profound transformation of social life. In the introduction to The Permanent Revolution he describes the democratic revolution as a necessary preparation for the socialist stage, and Trotsky continues:

"The second aspect of the 'permanent' theory already characterizes the socialist revolution as such. For an indefinitely long time and in constant internal struggle, all social relations are transformed. The process necessarily retains a political character, that is, it develops through collisions of various groups of society in transformation. Outbreaks of civil war and foreign wars alternate with periods of 'peaceful' reforms. Revolutions in economy, technique, science, the family, morals and usages develop in complicated reciprocal action and do not allow society to reach equilibrium. Therein lies the permanent character of the socialist revolution as such." (Page XXV)

Trotsky's foresight, based on thorough theoretical understanding, enabled him to describe accurately in 1930 the revolutionary process that is now unfolding in China. His view-

point, so clearly stated, of contradictory forces in motion and struggle, which do not allow society to reach equilibrium, but propels it constantly forward -- this is the dialectical position. Novack's view that a profound transformation of life (like the cultural revolution) cannot be accomplished amidst fierce social conflicts, and that it is not a weapon or phase in the class struggle, is, sad to say, far removed from the dialectical method.

In his famous Hundred Flowers Treatise of 1957 -- eight years after the initial revolutionary victory -- Mao Tse-tung emphasized: "Class struggle is not yet over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between various political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will still be long, devious and at times may even become very acute."

What Mao said here accords perfectly with Trotsky's analysis of the process of the socialist revolution. And the events of actual life in China today reinforce this analysis. Moreover, these events Mao and his collaborators carefully explain as a continuation of the uninterrupted revolution carried on to a new and higher stage.

What can we say about the pacifist notion presented by Comrade Novack, namely, that a thoroughgoing reconstruction of human relations cannot be accomplished amidst fierce social conflicts, and that it is not a weapon or phase in the class struggle. Certainly, this runs counter to Mao's views. But it is equally contrary to Trotsky's analysis. Novack's notion would seem to fit much better with the presumptuous claims officially trumpeted by "Results and Prospects" adopted by the CPSU Twenty-third Congress, the claim of having attained "The complete and final victory of socialism . . . class struggle in the USSR was entirely liquidated . . . the dictatorship of the proletariat ceases to be necessary. The state of the proletariat has been transformed into the socialist state of the entire people."

The Kremlin boasts are crude prevarications, of course. But, while not pretending an unprecedented flow of wealth, it certainly does lay claim to a wholly renovated social order, and the harmonious human relations of which Comrade Novack thinks the cultural revolution can be the ripened achievement. Both positions are travesties on fundamental Marxist concepts.

During our discussion with the British SLL in 1961 Comrade Cannon made a pertinent remark on the question of understanding revolutions. In a letter of May 22 to the PC he wrote: "Trotsky, in the middle Thirties, initiated extensive discussion and collaboration with left-centrists who only talked about revolution, and even that not very convincingly. The Cuban revolutionists have done more than talk, and they are not the only ones on trial from now on. We are also on trial."

What would our talk about revolution be worth if we could not recognize a revolution when we see it?"

This is even more true today in regard to China's socialist cultural revolution. It has presented an acid test to the party leaders and they have been found wanting. The revolutionary approach was lacking. All they have to show is political and theoretical bankruptcy; for there can be no greater error than that of failing to recognize a revolution that is unfolding before their very eyes.

Mao Tse-tung and his collaborators have always recognized that the winning of state power is only the beginning of the revolution; the starting point for the yet greater task of creating a new social system. The socialist transformation of the economic foundation has been brought about and socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership have been established. Since the economic basis has changed, they insist, the ideological superstructure must change accordingly. The proletariat must carry the socialist revolution through to the end on the ideological and cultural fronts. This is viewed in terms of history, in terms of an irreversible process of uprooting the old ideas, customs, habits, motivations, prejudices, arbitrary values and modes of thought implanted and sustained by thousands of years of feudalism and now standing in the way of historic progress. These survivals from the past must be replaced by a revolutionary quality and revolutionary ideas and motivations that correspond to the economic foundation. Only so can the dictatorship of the proletariat be further consolidated, the socialist economy developed and the conditions created for the gradual transition to communism.

In other words, this is the process that converts the permanent revolution from theory to the actual life of the people; and pretty much in the sense that Trotsky had visualized it. At the same time Mao and his collaborators are combatting the treachery of the Kremlin.

The socialist cultural revolution has become a critical movement of gigantic proportions. Not only the carry-overs from the old system but the persons at present in authority are subjected to criticism by the masses. Reports from China indicate that this means all persons, including those in the highest positions. Criticism and self-criticism are reaching higher levels and wider scope in a great movement of rectification. Mistakes and faulty policies are brought into the open. Many millions, workers, peasants, soldiers, students and intellectuals are stood on their feet to join political debate in the streets, factories, army, communes, schools, everywhere. The toiling masses are aroused to criticize and supervise their leaders. This is proletarian democracy in its broadest and most authentic form.

The Communist Party is similarly subjected to critical scrutiny by the masses. This is a most healthy aspect of the great debate. Between the Chinese Communist party and the toiling masses a close interrelationship is maintained. It is exceedingly complex in its broad, varied and manifold ramifications that extend throughout the huge country; it is very simple in its directness. The party gives leadership to the mass of the people who, in turn, support the party. The toiling masses and the leadership depend on each other.

Subjecting the Communist Party to critical scrutiny by the masses is not a new thing in China. One such experience has been authentically and fundamentally documented by William Hinton, who was in the village of Long Bow in 1948, during the stormy battles of the revolutionary war to establish the new social order. Hinton writes that the drama of confrontation between the members of the Communist Party branch -- whose membership, because of the war, had not previously been made public -- and the people of Long Bow "jarred me into acute awareness of the boldness of the method chosen for the reorganization of the party. . . . It was a measure of the party leaders' confidence in the success of the Revolutionary War. . . . By declaring in favor of open membership, they had assumed a great risk in order to take a giant step forward."

Hinton continues: "The Central Committee now boldly declared: 'All meetings of all party branches to discuss problems concerning the interests of the masses . . . should be participated in by the non-party masses . . . and all the good and bad phenomena within the party can thus be exposed before the people for supervision and criticism or for support.' "  
(Fanshen, pp. 321, 322)

What happened during the stormy battles of the revolutionary war is now being repeated. Both the good and the bad features of the Communist Party are exposed before the people for supervision and criticism or for support. And the method pursued is a measure of the party leaders' confidence, this time, in the rationality and success of the socialist cultural revolution and its objectives. It is a measure of their well founded and positive conviction that socialist society grows more united and consolidated precisely through the ceaseless process of correctly dealing with and resolving contradictions.

Only supremely confident leaders dare set in motion a process of critical examination which does not exempt their very selves. And so, the Mao Tse-tung leadership has acted, this time, to boldly arouse the toiling masses to meet head-on every challenge of the bourgeoisie in the ideological field in order to make another great leap forward.

The immediate aim of the socialist cultural revolution is, as often stated by the Chinese, for the people to establish their control over ideology, culture and education as effectively as they did over the state and the national economy in 1949.

To do this, they must remove from office those in authority who use their influence to promote the capitalist road, and repudiate the bourgeois academic "authorities" who use their scholastic standing to sabotage the revolution. This a battle for the next generation, whether it shall be bourgeois or revolutionary in mind.

The long-range goal is to eliminate the three major differences, between manual and mental labor, between worker and peasant, and between town and country. These differences must give way to higher forms of social relations. They are to find their synthesis in a socialist culture: a culture which truly represents the organic sum of human knowledge and experience; a culture that embraces and penetrates all areas of human pursuits and unifies them into a system of socialist humanism.

The long-rang goal is also the remaking of the mind of man. Envisaged is the creation of a new man who, while being a cog in a complex and intricate social mechanism, at the same time governs and controls its operation. A new man who is capable of building the association in which, according to the Communist Manifesto, the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all.

The socialist cultural revolution in China opens a new chapter in man's long struggle for a truly rational order of social relations. Even though it carries the unqualified distinction of a unique social and scientific experiment, it is a chapter now just beginning. The people have started out on a dauntless and many-faceted drive to reconstruct human relations anew from the bottom up. This is the logical sequel to the profound and wholly progressive developments that have already taken place in China. This cultural revolution is itself a process that will unfold through many stages and different phases. Many more ideological and political struggles will still have to be fought to a finish. Many more contradictions will have to be resolved before all social relations are thoroughly reconstructed and a socialist culture -- a truly human culture -- is created. For this is the collective task of a succession of generations. But the direction of the cultural revolution is unmistakable. Its real essence signifies a giant leap forward. As it makes progress in the uprooting of all the survivals of bourgeois ideology and capitalist practices and makes strides toward the rational system of human relations, it marks the frontier between two historic epochs.

\* \* \*