

## We Workers Are Firmly Opposed to the "Class Cooperation" Theory

by

Miao Lung-chiang (繆龍江)

Shanghai Printing Press of the Chunghua Book Store

(Hung-ch'i [Red Flag], No. 1, January 6, 1965)

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory of "combining two into one" is a fallacy publicizing "class cooperation." In order to provide "class cooperation" with a "theoretical" basis, he has openly claimed: "The capitalists have means of production but no labor power while the workers have labor power but no means of production. Therefore, means of production have linked up the bourgeoisie and the proletariat." Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's statement has completely obliterated the relationship between the bourgeoisie as the exploiting class and the working class as the exploited and described the relationship between the two opposing classes as a relationship of "mutual aid and cooperation." I could not help from feeling enraged after reading it.

Before liberation, we workers suffered ruthless oppression and exploitation by the capitalists. I became a child worker when I was 11. At that time the workers toiled from early in the morning until late at night. They worked as long as 12 hours a day, and the wage for a child worker was less than three silver dollars. This was not enough for one to live on three congee meals a day. We regularly patronized the pawnshops, pawning our cotton-padded coat in summer and summer clothes in winter. Our families constantly lived on borrowed money and rice, and sometimes we had to work with an empty stomach while the capitalists squandered away their money in feasts and led a lustful life. These were the days which Comrade Yang Hsien-chen describes as the days in which "the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are linked together." Until I die I shall never forget the miserable life I led in those days.

After giving the matter careful thought, I feel that in saying that means of production "link the bourgeoisie and the proletariat together," Comrade Yang Hsien-chen talks almost like the capitalists before liberation. At that time, when we workers rose in struggle, the capitalists often said: "All of us must make a success of the factory and keep it going. The factory feeds both us factory owners and you workers. The collapse of the factory will mean that all of us will have nothing to eat." Didn't these words of the capitalists also mean that "means of production (that is the factory according to the capitalists) link the bourgeoisie and the proletariat together?" Weren't they aimed at telling us that there were "common interests" for the capitalists and the workers, and that we workers must give up our struggle and inseparably "link ourselves" with them forever? Although Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's statement wears a "theoretical" mantle, yet it means to say the same thing the capitalists say. There the line of demarcation between exploitation and the exploited is made very vague, and class struggle disappears altogether.

We all know that the capitalists merely tried to deceive people when they said that "with the capital preserved, all can be fed." Under the capitalist system, the capitalists wanted "to preserve their factories" only for the purpose of exploiting the workers and making big money, but not just for the purpose of "feeding everybody." We workers were exploited by the capitalists to the utmost. We were underfed and were often dismissed. The printing press of the Chunghua Book Store before liberation was a case in point. At that time, out of the fear that the workers might go on strike, the capitalists often dismissed workers and divided the workers into permanent workers and temporary workers to undermine the solidarity of the working ranks. They fanned dissension among the workers by telling the permanent workers that they should not mix with the temporary workers and telling the temporary workers that "as long as the factory is in operation, their meals are assured." However, the livelihood of neither the permanent workers nor the temporary workers was safeguarded. The capitalists often dismissed them at random as their own interests and requirements might dictate. Is not Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's statement just made for the purpose of defending the capitalists?

What is more infuriating to people is that, as we all know, the capitalists do not labor although they can. They depend on the means of production they possess to force the workers to sell their labor power, and squeeze surplus value from them. However, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says that "the capitalists have no labor power," and must therefore hire workers. Is it not true that he makes an open apology for the capitalists to cover up their cruel exploitation of the workers for the purpose of making a higher margin of profit?

Now, let us analyze in the concrete once again why this "theory" of Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's is preposterous.

According to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen, because "the capitalists have means of production but no labor power while the workers have labor power but no means of production," "therefore means of production have linked the bourgeoisie and the proletariat together." That means the capitalists and workers give what they have for what they have not, with one side contributing machinery and the other side contributing manpower. Both sides reap benefits when they are united and both sides suffer when they are divided. This viewpoint is also a concrete illustration of Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's viewpoint of "combining two into one." Here I want to ask Comrade Yang Hsien-chen two questions.

First, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says: "The capitalists have means of production but no labor power, while the workers have labor power but no means of production." Under the capitalist system, the workers really own nothing except labor power. Let us ask: Why is it that the workers have no means of production while the capitalist "possess" means of production? Everybody knows that labor creates the human world, and that means of production are created by the workers. The means of production in the hands of the bourgeoisie is, in the final analysis, robbed from the hands of the laboring people.

Marx once said that the historical origin of capital is the direct exploitation of the workers. Capital in the world is a dirty thing with blood dripping from every pore from head to foot. This is a fact. Many of our workers and their ancestors were poor peasants by origin. Some of them were poverty-stricken handicraftsmen. As victims of oppression and exploitation, they lost all means of production, and had no alternative but to sell their lives to the capitalists. Theirs were painful experiences soaked with tears and blood. However, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen fundamentally makes no mention of the fact that the laboring people have no alternative but to sell their labor power to the capitalists because they have been robbed of their means of production. Nor does he say anything about the fact that it is by way of exploiting the laboring people that the capitalists gained possession of their means of production. By describing things in this way, if Comrade Yang Hsien-chen does not try to cover up the 'cruel exploitation of the working class by the bourgeoisie and class contradiction, and to benumb the class consciousness of the working class, what is he driving at?

Second, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen holds that because "the capitalists have means of production but no labor power," they therefore want to "join forces" with the workers. We want to ask: What after all makes capitalists hire workers? Everybody knows that the capitalists open factories and hire workers not because they want to develop the functions of means of production and to increase the wealth of society, but because they want to exploit the workers and to make money. The bourgeoisie seek only profit. If there is no money to make, no matter how many means of production they may have, they will just put them aside, and would not be willing "to join forces with the working class." Before liberation, many capitalists hired workers when business was brisk and made a good profit. When business was slack, they laid off the workers, especially the old workers who took a strong stand in struggle. They not only accumulated capital and gained possession of means of production through plundering, but also made use of means of production to exploit the workers and to increase their personal wealth.

Comrade Yang Hsien-chen says that means of production "link the bourgeoisie and the proletariat together," but he fundamentally makes no mention of the fact that this so-called "link" is the relationship between the exploiting and the exploited, the relationship between the oppressing and the oppressed. Although we workers were exploited and oppressed to the utmost in the past, yet Comrade Yang Hsien-chen makes breezy use of the word "link" to obliterate the class struggle, and describes the relationship of the capitalists and workers as if it is a relationship based upon complete "equality" and "mutual aid and cooperation." Moreover, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen talks only about what he calls the "link," but makes no mention at all about the transformation of opposites and the need to eliminate the bourgeoisie and exploitation, as if the workers are destined "to combine" forever with the capitalists. How preposterous this is! And how can we workers help from feeling enraged after reading it!

This fallacy of Comrade Yang Hsien-chen and the theory of Chou Ku-ch'eng -- "the opposition and coordination of the landlords and the tenants" -- are birds of the same feather. Chou Ku-ch'eng has this to say: The rich must "recruit the poor to carry out production for them," and the poor must "work for the rich to make a living;" "the two poles of the rich and the poor can thus be combined." One says that the peasants and the landlords are "two combined into one," while the other says that the workers and the capitalists are "two combined into one." In publicizing "class cooperation," Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "theory" and Mr. Chou Ku-ch'eng's "theory" are really "combined" together.

In publicizing this kind of "class cooperation" fallacy, Comrade Yang Hsien-chen wants but to make us workers forget the class exploitation and class oppression which we suffered in the past and forsake class struggle. Educated by the Party, however, the working class of China knows it can never be "combined into one" with the bourgeoisie, both in the past and the present. If we had done this in the past, the working class could never have freed itself from the status of the exploited and oppressed and won victory in the revolutionary struggle. If we do this now, we would run the risk of losing the fruit of victory of the revolution. We workers know very well that quite a number of bourgeois elements still refuse to remold themselves honestly today. They constantly spread dissension among the workers and disseminate decadent bourgeois ideas to corrode the workers. By saying that "we now share mess halls and labor with the workers, and what we lack is only a red pass," some people also vainly hope to combine themselves with the workers "from two into one." Some bourgeois elements also join forces with other exploiting elements in society to carry out activities against socialism and for the development of capitalism in the vain hope of restoring capitalism. If our working class gives credence to Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's theory of "combining two into one," no longer persists in work for the education and remolding of the bourgeois elements, no longer heightens our revolutionary vigilance, and no longer carries out the struggle for "the promotion of proletarian ideas and the destruction of bourgeois ideas," the poisonous ideas of the bourgeoisie will be allowed to run amok, and the bourgeois elements will be allowed to usurp the leadership. Doesn't this mean then that there is the danger for the bourgeoisie to "combine" us with the past? We can never allow this to occur. We certainly must take heed of what Chairman Mao says, firmly oppose the "class cooperation" fallacy, and carry the socialist revolution to the end.

(Reproduced from Chieh-fang Jih-pao, December 27, 1964)