### 第二节 所有制问题还没有完全解决

### Section 2 the problem of ownership has not been completely solved

所有制范围内的资产阶级法权没有完全取消

The bourgeoisie recht within the scope of ownership have not been completely abolished.

社会主义公有制建立以后，所有制问题是不是就完全解决了呢？在政治经济学领域，长期以来流行一种看法，认为社会主义所有制一旦建立，所有制问题就完全解决了。这种看法的错误是，把所有制仅仅看成是一种物，是单纯的厂房、土地、机器、工具、原料等生产资料，以为这些物原来在资本家手里或者在私人手里，无产阶级和劳动人民把它拿过来，问题就解决了。这种看法是片面的，是违背马克思主义的。

After the establishment of socialist public ownership, will the problem of ownership be completely solved? In the field of political economy, there has long been a popular view that once socialist ownership is established, the problem of ownership will be completely solved. The mistake of this view is to regard ownership as only a kind of thing, a simple means of production such as factory buildings, land, machinery, tools, raw materials, and so on, thinking that these things are originally in the hands of capitalists or in the hands of private people. the proletariat and the working people brought it over and the problem was solved. This view is one-sided and runs counter to Marxism.

马克思在分析资本家所有制的时候指出：“资本不是一种物，而是一种以物为媒介的人和人之间的社会关系。”[①](#_bookmark25)毛主席也一再教导我们，社会主义所有制建立以后，在所有制方面， 问题还没有完全解决。这些论述都说明，生产资料所有制并不是物，也不是人同物的关系，而是一种同物联系着的人和人之间的社会关系。只有对实际的经济运动加以考察和分析，才能对社会主义所有制问题得到一个正确的了解。

When analyzing the ownership of capitalists, Marx pointed out: " **capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons, established by the instrumentality of things.**" ① Chairman Mao has also repeatedly taught us that after the establishment of socialist ownership, the problem of ownership has not been completely solved. All these discussions show that the ownership of the means of production is not a thing, nor is it the relationship between people and things, but a kind of social relationship between people and people connected with things. Only by investigating and analyzing the actual economic movement can we get a correct understanding of the problem of socialist ownership.

根据马克思主义的理论，来看我国二十多年来所有制关系的实际运动，完全证实了这样一个真理：所有制变更了，社会主义所有制建立了，并不等于所有制问题完全解决了。

According to Marxist theory, the actual movement of ownership relations in China over the past 20 years has fully confirmed such a truth: the change of ownership and the establishment of socialist ownership does not mean that the problem of ownership has been completely solved.

社会主义全民所有制和集体所有制的建立，当然是所有制关系上的伟大变革，这是肯定无疑的。但是，在所有制方面， 问题还没有完全解决。这是因为，在所有制范围内，资产阶级法权还没有完全取消。

There is no doubt that the establishment of socialist ownership by the whole people and collective ownership is of course a great change in ownership relations. However, in terms of ownership, the problem has not been completely solved. This is because, within the scope of ownership, the bourgeoisie recht have not been completely abolished.

列宁说：“‘资产阶级法权’承认生产资料是个人的私有财产。”[②](#_bookmark26)在一九五六年，当我国对个体农业、对个体手工业和对资本主义工商业的社会主义改造基本完成以后，在我国工、农、商业中还存在着部分的私有制。到一九七三年，我国工业中还有人数占工业从业人员总数百分之零点八的个体手工业； 农村人民公社社员的少量的自留地和家庭副业也是个体所有制性质的；商业中还有占全国商品零售总额百分之零点二的个体商贩。此外，在农村中还有相当数量的集市贸易，这是建立在个体所有制基础上的一种商品流通。我国工、农、商业中部分私有制的存在，说明表现为私有制的资产阶级法权也还没有完全取消。城乡资本主义势力事实上时时在利用这一方面实际存在的资产阶级法权，发展私人经济，冲击和破坏社会主义经济。在社会主义公有制的范围内，资产阶级法权是不是完全取消了呢？也还没有完全取消。社会主义集体所有制是公有化程度较低的一种社会主义公有制。一个集体经济单位，就是一种共同占有生产资料进行共同劳动、共同分配的独立的生产、经营单位。各个集体经济单位拥有的土地、生产资料、劳动力和人口是不一样的。在这样的条件下，各个集体经济单位投入的等量劳动就不能获得等量的收益。比如，各个人民公社以及同一个公社的各个生产大队以及同一个大队的各生产队，由于土地肥沃程度的不同或所处地理位置不同，投入等量劳动（包括活劳动和物化劳动）所获得的收入却不同，由此形成级差土地收入。在其他条件相同的情况下，占有土地质量较好、离销售市场较近的公社、生产队所获得的收入就高，反之就低。

Lenin said: "’**Буржуазное право’ признает их(Средства производства) частной собственностью отдельных лиц.**"( Lenin said: "’Bourgeois law’ recognizes [the means of production] as the private property of individuals.”)

In 1956, after the socialist transformation of individual agriculture, individual handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce was basically completed, there was still some private ownership in industry, agriculture and commerce in our country. By 1973, there were still individual handicrafts in China's industry, which accounted for 0.8% of the total number of industrial employees, and a small number of private plots and household sidelines of members of rural people's communes were also of the nature of individual ownership. there are also individual traders who account for 0.2% of the country's total retail sales.

In addition, there is a considerable amount of market trade in rural areas, which is a kind of commodity circulation based on individual ownership. The existence of part of private ownership in industry, agriculture and commerce in our country shows that the bourgeois recht of private ownership has not been completely abolished. As a matter of fact, the capitalist forces in urban and rural areas are always making use of the actual bourgeois recht in this aspect to develop the private economy, impact and destroy the socialist economy.

Within the scope of socialist public ownership, has the recht of the bourgeoisie been completely abolished? It hasn't been completely cancelled yet. Socialist collective ownership is a kind of socialist public ownership with a low degree of public ownership. A collective economic unit is an independent production and management unit that collectively owns the means of production for joint labor and joint distribution. The land, means of production, labor force and population owned by each collective economic unit are different. Under such conditions, each collective economic unit cannot obtain the same amount of income by performing the same amount of labor.

For example, various people’s communes, various production brigade in the same commune, and various production teams in the same brigade, due to the different levels of fertility of the land or different geographical locations, the income obtained by putting in the same amount of labor (including living labor and materialized labor) is different, thus forming a differential land income. Under the same other conditions, the income of communes and production teams with good land quality and close to the sales market is high, and vice versa.

① 马克思：《资本论》第 1 卷。《马克思恩格斯全集》第 23 卷，第 834 页。

② 《国家与革命》。《列宁选集》第 3 卷，人民出版社 1972 年版，第 252 页。

从土质情况来看，以上海市郊区马桥公社的两个片为例，一个片叫 “俞塘片”，以黄泥头为主，土质疏松，水利条件好，因而产量较高。1974 年，这个片三个大队粮食平均亩产达一千六百三十九斤；另外一个片名叫“邻松片”，以青紫泥为主，地势低洼，一遇下雨，就要成涝； 天一晴，地又硬得坌不动，因此产量较低。1974 年，这个片的五个大队粮食平均亩产量为一千四百二十四斤，比前一个片每亩少二百十五斤。从所处的地理位置来看，以上海市郊区为例，靠近市区或工业区的生产队，同远郊队相比，具有不少有利的条件。一是肥源丰富，可以弄到工业废水、废渣作肥料，或者只要出几个劳动力，就能搞到工厂、里弄的人粪。二是运输方便，靠近市区的生产队，无论运垃圾、送蔬菜、踏泔脚，用工比远郊队省得多。远郊队不但用工大，车辆的损耗也大。以上各方面的因素，造成了近郊队和远郊队的农本有着很大的差别。如， 上海市上海县虹桥公社凌家弄生产队，离市区近，农本只占总收入的13.7%；而离市区稍远的西郊四队，农本却要占总收入的 33.5%。

(Pending translation)

当然，不同集体经济之间在农本和收入上的差别，并不都是由级差土地收入造成的，而是有着多方面的原因。特别是领导班子是否坚持党的基本路线，是否调动了广大贫下中农的社会主义积极性，是否贯彻执行了“以粮为纲，全面发展”和“勤俭办社”的方针，等等，同集体经济的生产和收入有很大的关系。“事在人为”。条件较差，经过人们的努力是可以改变的。大寨大队靠毛泽东思想挂帅，战天斗地，重新安排山河，由穷变富，最雄辩地说明了这一点。但是，在人的主观能动作用大致相同的条件下，占有土地和生产资料的多少质量的好坏，对于集体所有制经济的生产发展和社员收益的多少，毕竟是有很大影响的。正是从这里可以看出，同社会主义全民所有制比较起来，劳动群众集体所有制是一种公有化程度较低的社会主义公有制，在生产资料占有关系上，带有较多的资产阶级法权。就社会主义全民所有制和集体所有制之间的关系来看，它们虽然都是社会主义公有制，但是，两者在公有化程度上却存在着差别。这种差别，说到底仍然是表现在对生产资料占有关系上的不平等。同时，全民所有制企业和集体所有制企业之间在交换过程中仍然表现为商品交换的关系，工农业产品价格之间的“剪刀差”虽然比旧社会有很大的缩小，但还难以完全取消，因此，在社会主义所有制范围内，资产阶级法权的存在， 不仅表现在各个集体所有制经济之间，而且还表现在全民所有制和集体所有制的关系上。马克思、列宁曾经设想过的社会主义社会资产阶级法权在所有制范围内已经不存在了，是指的全部生产资料已经归整个社会所有，我们显然还没有达到这一步。“私产和公产之间有一条由此达彼的桥梁”[①](#_bookmark27)，我们显然还没有走完这座桥梁。

勤俭办社 Run co-operatives with diligence and thrift

以粮为纲，全面发展 Take Grain as the Key Link and Ensure All-round Development

Of course, the differences in farming capital and income between different collective economies are not all caused by differential land income, but have many reasons.

Whether the leading body adheres to the Party's basic line, whether it has aroused the socialist enthusiasm of the broad masses of poor and lower-middle peasants, whether it has implemented the principles of " Take Grain as the Key Link and Ensure All-round Development " and "Run co-operatives with diligence and thrift", and so on, have a lot to do with the production and income of the collective economy. "everything is man-made."

Although the conditions are poor, it can be changed through people's efforts. This is most eloquently illustrated by the fact that the Dazhai brigade is led by Mao Zedong thought, fighting against heaven and earth, rearranging mountains and rivers from poor to rich.

However, under the condition that people's subjective initiative is roughly the same, the quality of the possession of land and the means of production has a great impact on the production and development of the economy of collective ownership and the income of its members. It is from this that we can see that, compared with socialist ownership by the whole people, collective ownership by the working people is a kind of socialist public ownership with a relatively low degree of public ownership, with more bourgeois recht in the possession of the means of production.

From the perspective of the relationship between socialist ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, although they are both socialist public ownership, there is a difference in the degree of public ownership between the two. In the final analysis, this difference is still manifested in the inequality in the possession of the means of production. At the same time, the exchange process between state-owned enterprises and collectively-owned enterprises is still manifested as a commodity exchange relationship. Although the "scissors gap" between industrial and agricultural product prices is much smaller than in the old society, it is difficult to completely cancel it. Within the scope of socialist ownership, the existence of bourgeois recht is not only reflected in the various collective ownership economies, but also in the relationship between national ownership and collective ownership.

The bourgeois recht of the socialist society once envisioned by Marx and Lenin no longer exists within the scope of ownership, meaning that all the means of production have been owned by the whole society, and we have obviously not yet reached this stage. “**There is a bridge leading from private property to public property**”①, we obviously have not finished this bridge.

社会主义全民所有制虽然是一种公有化程度较高的社会主义所有制形式，但是，它是一种刚刚从旧社会脱胎出来的全民所有制，因而也还不能不带有旧社会的传统或痕迹。首先，社会主义全民所有制条件下劳动者同生产资料的结合，还要受到脑力劳动和体力劳动这一旧的社会分工的束缚，只要这种旧的社会分工仍然存在，管理社会主义全民所有制经济，就仍然是“特殊阶层的特殊职能”[②](#_bookmark28)，社会主义全民所有制的全民性，就不能不打上旧社会的烙印。其次，社会主义全民所有制企业虽然都属于全体劳动人民所有，没有不同的所有者，但是，社会主义全民所有制企业在生产、经营上是相对独立的经济单位， 相互之间存在着“你我界限”，要取得对方产品仍然要通过商品交换的方式。社会主义全民所有制各个企业之间的关系还是由商品关系联结着。这些情况表明，社会主义全民所有制和将来的共产主义全民所有制有所不同，它还保留着某些旧社会的传统或痕迹，保留着反映这些传统或痕迹的资产阶级法权。

Although socialist ownership by the whole people is a form of socialist ownership with a high degree of public ownership, it is a form of ownership by the whole people that has just emerged from the old society, so it still has to bear the traditions or traces of the old society. First of all, the combination of laborers with the means of production under socialist ownership by the whole people will also be bound by the old social division of labor, mental and manual labor, as long as this old social division of labor still exists and the management of the socialist economy under ownership by the whole people is still a "***special functions of a special section*.**" [②](#_bookmark28), the whole people's character of socialist ownership by the whole people cannot but bear the brand of the old society.

Second, although socialist enterprises owned by the whole people are owned by all the working people and have no special owners, they are relatively independent economic units in production and operation, there is a "boundary between you and me" between them, and the products of each other still have to be obtained by means of commodity exchange.

The relationship between socialist enterprises under ownership by the whole people is still linked by commodity relations. These situations show that socialist ownership by the whole people is different from communist ownership by the whole people in the future. It still retains some traditions or traces of the old society and bourgeois recht that reflect these traditions or traces.

① 《矛盾论》。《毛泽东选集》第 1 卷，人民出版社 1967 年横排本，第 304页。

② 《国家与革命》。《列宁选集》第 3 卷，人民出版社 1972 年版，第 213页。

两种社会主义公有制都有一个领导权问题

Both kinds of socialist public ownership have a question of leadership

生产资料所有制的社会主义改造基本完成以后，所有制问题并没有完全解决，除了前面分析的资产阶级法权在所有制范围内没有完全取消以外，同这个问题相联系的一个重要问题， 就是全民所有制经济和集体所有制经济都还有一个领导权问题，有一个生产资料实际上归哪个阶级所有的问题。

After the socialist transformation of ownership of the means of production has been basically completed, the problem of ownership has not been completely solved. Apart from the fact that the bourgeois recht analyzed earlier have not been completely abolished within the scope of ownership, an important issue related to this problem is that there is still a question of leadership in both the economy under ownership by the whole people and the economy under collective ownership, that is, the question of which class the means of production actually belongs to.

所有制问题，如同其他问题一样，不能只看它的形式，还要看它的实际内容，看它实际上掌握在哪个阶级手里。这是马克思主义在所有制问题上的一个十分重要的理论和实践问题。恩格斯在阐述废除生产资料私有制和建立生产资料公有制时指出：“大工业造成一种绝对必需的局面，那就是建立一个全新的社会组织，在这个新的社会组织里，工业生产将不是由相互竞争的厂主来领导，而是由整个社会按照确定的计划和社会全体成员的需要来领导。”[①](#_bookmark30)恩格斯的话告诉我们，生产资料所有制的性质集中表现在哪个阶级取得对企业的领导权问题上。企业领导权的归属变了，生产资料所有制的性质也就改变了。资本家及其代理人领导企业，必然为资本家的利益服务，必然是资本家所有制。生产资料的共产主义公有制则必然要废除私人对企业的领导权，而由整个社会来领导，用以满足社会全体成员的需要。社会主义公有制是全社会的劳动群众或一部分劳动群众共同占有生产资料的一种所有制形式，这种所有制形式要求国营企业和集体企业的领导权必须掌握在真正的马克思主义者和劳动群众的手里，才能保证生产资料被运用来为劳动者的利益服务，体现社会主义所有制的性质。

The question of ownership, like other issues, should not only look at its form, but also at its actual content, and at which class actually holds the leadership. This is a very important theoretical and practical issue of Marxism on the issue of ownership. In expounding the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the establishment of public ownership of the means of production, Engels pointed out: " **big industry … it makes unavoidably necessary an entirely new organization of society in which production is no longer directed by mutually competing individual industrialists but rather by the whole society operating according to a definite plan and taking account of the needs of all.**" [①](#_bookmark30)

Engels' words tell us that the nature of the ownership of the means of production is mainly reflected in the question of which class obtains the leadership over the enterprise. When the ownership of the enterprise leadership changes, so does the nature of the ownership of the means of production. When capitalists and their agents lead enterprises, they are bound to serve the interests of capitalists and are bound to be owned by capitalists. On the other hand, the communist public ownership of the means of production is bound to abolish private leadership over enterprises and be led by the whole society to meet the needs of all members of society.

Socialist public ownership is a form of ownership in which the working masses of the whole society or part of the working masses jointly occupy the means of production. This form of ownership requires that the leadership of state-owned enterprises and collective enterprises must be held in the hands of real Marxists and working masses, so as to ensure that the means of production are used to serve the interests of workers and embody the nature of socialist ownership.

① 恩格斯：《共产主义原理》。《马克思恩格斯选集》第 1 卷，人民出版社 1972

年版，第 217 页。

国际共产主义运动历史经验和我国革命的实践证明，社会主义公有制的建立，并不意味着国营企业和集体企业的领导权就已真正掌握在无产阶级和劳动人民的手里了。在无产阶级夺取政权，基本上实现生产资料所有制的社会主义改造以后，被推翻的地主、资产阶级人还在，心不死。新的资产阶级分子还在一批又一批地产生。资产阶级特别是党内资产阶级必然千方百计地篡夺企业的领导权。同时，由于社会主义社会还存在着工农差别、城乡差别、体力劳动和脑力劳动的差别，还存在着旧的社会分工，因而，领导和管理的职能还不可能由所有的人轮流行使，而只能相对地固定在一部分干部身上。在这样的条件下，那些由无产阶级专政的国家委派到企业掌握领导权的干部，如果成为真正的马克思主义者，能同劳动群众一道来经营、管理企业，在生产和经营活动中真正按照劳动者的利益来办事， 社会主义公有制的性质就得到了保证。反之，如果这些领导干部蜕变为披着共产党员外衣的走资派，或者受到资产阶级的腐蚀，在领导生产和经营活动中不是代表劳动者的利益而是代表着资产阶级的利益，那末，尽管企业在名义上仍然叫做社会主义国营企业或社会主义集体企业，但是企业的领导权实际上已落到资产阶级手里，所有制实际上也不同程度地蜕化变质了。

The historical experience of the international communist movement and the practice of our revolution have proved that the establishment of socialist public ownership does not mean that the leadership of state-owned and collective enterprises is really in the hands of the proletariat and the working people.

After the proletariat seized political power and basically realized the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, the overthrown landlords and bourgeoisie are still alive and their desire to restore capitalism will not die. New bourgeois elements are still emerging one after another.

The bourgeoisie, especially the bourgeoisie in the Party, is bound to do everything possible to usurp the leadership of enterprises. At the same time, because there are still differences between workers and farmers, between urban and rural areas, and between physical and mental work in socialist society, as well as the old social division of labor, it is impossible for all people to take turns to exercise the functions of leadership and management. it can only be relatively fixed on some cadres.

Under such conditions, if those cadres assigned to enterprises by countries under the dictatorship of the proletariat become true Marxists and can run and manage enterprises together with the working masses, truly act in accordance with the interests of the laborers in our production and business activities, the nature of socialist public ownership will be guaranteed.

Conversely, if these leading cadres degenerate into capitalist roaders dressed as Communists, or are corrupted by the bourgeoisie, they do not represent the interests of the laborers but the interests of the bourgeoisie in leading production and business activities. Enterprises are still called socialist state-owned enterprises or socialist collective enterprises in name, but the leadership of the enterprises has actually fallen into the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the ownership system has actually degenerated to varying degrees.

所以，任何社会主义企业，都有领导权名义上和实际上掌握在哪一个阶级手里的问题。毛主席在党的九届一中全会上指出： “据我观察，不讲全体，也不讲绝大多数，恐怕是相当大的一个多数的工厂里头，领导权不在真正的马克思主义者、不在工人群众手里。过去领导工厂的，不是没有好人。有好人，党委书记、副书记、委员，都有好人，支部书记有好人。但是，他是跟着过去刘少奇那种路线走，无非是搞什么物质刺激，利润挂帅，不提倡无产阶级政治，搞什么奖金，等等。”“但是， 工厂里确有坏人”。“就是说明革命没有完”[①](#_bookmark31)。

Therefore, any socialist enterprise has the question of which class holds the leadership in name and in fact. Chairman Mao pointed out at the first Plenary session of the Ninth CPC Central Committee: **“From my observations, I am afraid that in a fairly large majority of factories — I don’t mean all or the overwhelming majority — leadership was not in the hands of real Marxists and the masses of workers. Not that there were no good people in the leadership of the factories. There were. There were good people among the secretaries, deputy secretaries and members of Party committees and among the Party branch secretaries. But they followed that line of Liu Shao-chi’s, just resorting to material incentive, putting profit in command, and instead of promoting proletarian politics, handing out bonuses, and so forth." “But there are indeed bad people in the factories.” "This shows that the revolution is still unfinished.**"

那末，怎样鉴别企业的领导权在不在真正的马克思主义者和劳动群众手里呢？这就要从企业的生产和经营活动过程中进行考察。各个阶级都是按照一定的路线进行生产和经营活动的， 因此，只要看一下企业的领导者执行什么路线，也就可以看出所有制关系体现了哪个阶级的利益。

In that case, how can we tell whether the leadership of the enterprise is in the hands of real Marxists and the working masses? This should be examined from the process of the production and management activities of the enterprise. All classes carry out production and business activities according to a certain line, so as long as we look at the line followed by the leaders of the enterprise, we can see which class's interests are embodied in the ownership relationship.

党的马克思主义路线，集中地体现着无产阶级和全体劳动人民的根本利益。在社会主义企业的生产和经营活动中，如果贯彻的是马克思主义路线，这就表明，企业的生产资料确实是按照劳动者的利益来支配，是用来服务于劳动者的利益的，那里的领导权就是掌握在真正的马克思主义者和劳动群众手里。如果企业贯彻的是修正主义路线，这就表明，企业的生产资料实际上是按照复辟资本主义的需要来支配的，是服务于资产阶级的利益的。在企业的生产和经营活动中，如果不是坚持无产阶级政治挂帅，而是搞什么“利润挂帅”，那就是在根本上离开了社会主义的方向，改变了社会主义生产的目的，而滑到资本主义邪路上去了，发展下去，就将使生产资料最终转化为资本，转化为不顾人民利益、单纯追求利润的工具了。

The party's Marxist line centrally embodies the fundamental interests of the proletariat and all the working people. If the Marxist line is carried out in the production and management activities of socialist enterprises, it shows that the means of production of the enterprises are indeed controlled in accordance with the interests of the laborers and are used to serve the interests of the laborers. The leadership there is in the hands of real Marxists and the working masses. If the enterprise adheres to the revisionist line, it shows that the means of production of the enterprise are actually controlled in accordance with the needs of the restoration of capitalism and serve the interests of the bourgeoisie. In the production and business activities of enterprises, if they do not insist on proletarian politics but "putting profits in command", they will fundamentally deviate from the socialist direction and change the purpose of socialist production. If it slips into the evil road of capitalism, if it continues to develop, it will eventually turn the means of production into capital and into a tool for the simple pursuit of profits regardless of the interests of the people.

① 转引自《红旗》杂志 1975 年第 4 期。

因此，要使企业沿着社会主义方向前进，在所有制问题上使名义和实际统一起来，就必须使企业的领导权既掌握在马克思主义者手里，同时又为广大劳动群众所掌握。领导权掌握在广大劳动群众手里，是指广大劳动群众在党的一元化领导下， 真正以主人的身份直接参加企业的领导和管理，突破脑力劳动和体力劳动这种旧的社会分工的界限，抓大事，管路线，掌方向，按照无产阶级和劳动人民的利益改造企业。广大群众这种领导企业的权利，是社会主义公有制性质的体现。不能认为， 劳动群众对社会主义企业没有领导权，只有在某些人领导下的工作权、受教育权、休息权等等。掌握企业的领导权，这是劳动群众的根本权利；没有这个权利，其他权利也就没有保障。企业的领导权既要掌握在真正的马克思主义者手里，还要掌握在广大劳动群众手里，这是伟大领袖毛主席总结了国际共产主义运动的历史经验所提出的一个重要问题。从国际共产主义运动的历史来看，社会主义企业的领导权如果不掌握在真正的马克思主义者和广大劳动群众手里，而是实行修正主义的“一长制”，就会造成劳动群众实际上同生产资料分离。邓小平鼓吹什么“‘一长制’是好的，它并没有妨碍生产的发展和科学的发展”。这完全是资产阶级压迫工人的语言。在“一长制” 条件下，劳动群众被迫听命于“一长”，被“一长”当作单纯的劳动力在生产过程中使用，就丧失了根本的权利，最终必然受到资产阶级“一长”的剥削和压迫。恩格斯指出：“个人管理工业的必然后果就是私有制”[①](#_bookmark34)。邓小平步苏修的后尘，拼命鼓吹修正主义的“一长制”，就是为了把社会主义公有制蜕变为资本主义的私有制。

Therefore, in order to make enterprises advance in the socialist direction and unify nominal and practical ownership, we must make the leadership of enterprises not only in the hands of Marxists, but also in the hands of the broad masses of workers. Leadership is in the hands of the broad masses of working people, which means that under the unified leadership of the Party, the broad masses of working people truly participate directly in the leadership and management of enterprises as masters, breaking through the boundaries of the old division of labor between mental and manual labor, grasp major issues, manage the line, take charge of the direction, and transform enterprises in accordance with the interests of the proletariat and the working people.

The right of the broad masses to lead enterprises is the embodiment of the nature of socialist public ownership. It cannot be considered that the working masses have no leadership over socialist enterprises, but only the right to work, the right to education, the right to rest, and so on under the leadership of some people. It is the fundamental right of the working people to hold the leadership of the enterprise; without this right, there will be no guarantee of other rights. The leadership of enterprises should be held not only in the hands of real Marxists, but also in the hands of the broad masses of working people. This is an important issue raised by the great leader Chairman Mao in summing up the historical experience of the international communist movement.

What Deng Xiaoping preached is that "the 'one-man system' is good, and it has not hindered the development of production and the development of science." This is entirely the language of the bourgeoisie oppressing workers. Under the conditions of the “one leader system”, the working masses are forced to obey the orders of the “one leader” and are used as a simple labor force in the production process by the “one leader”. Long" exploitation and oppression. Engels pointed out: "The inevitable consequence of personal management of industry is private ownership." Following in the footsteps of Soviet revisionism, Deng Xiaoping desperately advocated the revisionist "one chief system" in order to transform socialist public ownership into capitalist private ownership.

Judging from the history of the international communist movement, if the leadership of socialist enterprises is not in the hands of real Marxists and the broad masses of workers, but a revisionist "one chief system", it will cause the working masses to be actually separated from the means of production. What Deng Xiaoping preached is that "the 'one chief system' is good, and it has not hindered the development of production and the development of science." This is entirely the language of the bourgeoisie oppressing workers. Under the condition of the " one chief system", the working people are forced to take orders from the one chief" and be used by the " one chief " as a simple labor force in the process of production, so they lose their fundamental rights and are bound to be exploited and oppressed by the bourgeoisie in the end. Engels pointed out: " **the management of industry by individuals necessarily implies private property**" Following in the footsteps of Soviet revisionism, Deng Xiaoping desperately advocated the revisionist "one chief system" in order to transform socialist public ownership into capitalist private ownership.