

Wason

DS

701

JPRS: 34,459

TI: 66-30899

H931+

8 March 1966

TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNG CH'I (RED FLAG)

No. 3, 1966

No. 21

(The Revolution In Historiography Must Be Carried To The  
Very End)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION  
JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE  
Building Tempo E  
Adams Drive, 4th and 6th Streets, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20443

Price: \$3.00

## FOREWORD

This publication was prepared under contract for the Joint Publications Research Service as a translation or foreign-language research service to the various federal government departments.

The contents of this material in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U. S. Government or of the parties to any distribution arrangement.

### PROCUREMENT OF JPRS REPORTS

All JPRS reports may be ordered from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information. Reports published prior to 1 February 1963 can be provided, for the most part, only in photocopy (xerox). Those published after 1 February 1963 will be provided in printed form.

Details on special subscription arrangements for any JPRS report will be provided upon request.

All current JPRS reports are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Publications which is available on subscription at \$4.50 per year (\$6.00 foreign) from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Both prices include an annual index.

All current JPRS scientific and technical reports are cataloged and subject-indexed in Technical Translations. This publication is issued semimonthly by the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information and is available on subscription (\$12.00 per year domestic, \$16.00 foreign) from the Superintendent of Documents. Semi-annual indexes to Technical Translations are available at additional cost.

TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNG CH'I (RED FLAG)

No. 3, 1966

No. 21

THE REVOLUTION IN HISTORIOGRAPHY MUST BE CARRIED  
TO THE VERY END

[Following is a translation of an article by Yin  
Ta (1438 6671) in the Chinese-language periodical  
Hung-ch'i (Red Flag), Peiping, No 3, 1966.]

(Prefatory Note: This article was written in Aug 1964.  
Only individual textual revisions have been made for its pub-  
lication at this time.)

Some erroneous tendencies in the study of historiography  
mentioned in the article were then investigated only as a kind  
of social phenomena, and no criticisms were made by name. How-  
ever, some erroneous tendencies referred to here are based on  
facts.

Comrades are requested to express their views as to  
whether the article is correct in its attitude toward the revo-  
lution in historiography.)

A. History Must Be Restudied in Its Entirety

To bring about the liberation of the proletariat, Marx  
and Engels made an exploration of the theories of philosophy,  
political economy, and socialism, established the revolutionary  
theoretical system of Marxism, and armed the proletariat ideo-  
logically, thereby stirring up the high tide of the movement of  
Communism. They created the historical interpretation of his-  
tory based on historical materialism, wrote a series of exem-  
plary historical works, and converted historiography into a  
true science. [See Note]

[Note]: See Engels: "To K. Schmidt" (5 August 1890), Marx

and Engels, Fan-tui Chi-hui-chu-i (Opposition to Opportunism), People's Publishing Agency, 1958, page 180.

We must understand that the time in which Marx and Engels lived was still the time when the capitalist class ruled the world and when the primary task of the proletariat was to extend the political struggle and seize power. Both Marx and Engels led the revolutionary movement of their time actively and devoted tremendous energy to the practical and theoretical revolutionary struggle which was then urgently needed. They did not have time to rewrite history in its entirety.

We now have the conditions for restudying and rewriting history in its entirety under the guidance of Marxism's scientific interpretation of history, exposing the crimes of the exploiting class in distorting and fabricating history, and handing back to the broad masses of working people the history created by them in its true light.

However, historiography has long been within the firm grip of the exploiting class. Historians of all countries in the world, who have been used by the exploiting class for its class interests and class prejudices for generations, have produced a mass of history which is nothing but distortion of fact. These history books, having long been circulated all over the world, have become a kind of traditional force and appeared as true history. Historical material, which has been accumulated over the years, after having been processed, reorganized, sifted, abbreviated, and interpreted by historians of the exploiting class, has inevitably been saturated with class prejudices and filled with a strong class character.

The restudy and rewriting of history in its entirety under the guidance of Marxism's historical materialism is a stupendous task. To carry out this revolutionary task, proletarian workers in historiography must completely liberate it from the hands of the exploiting class. This is indeed a revolution in historiography. It is an earth-shaking revolutionary movement. Without going through this revolution it would be impossible to clear historiography of the poison continually injected by the exploiting class into the science of history or to construct a true Marxist historiography or to write the true history of the working people.

For the purpose of monopolizing the interests of the capitalist group, imperialists have made use of history to propagandize their imperialist and colonialist theories and written all kinds of reactionary history books to stupefy and numb the peoples of all countries and to undermine their will to struggle. Reactionary nationalists have, in succession to imperialist

theories of history, distorted the history of their own countries and that of the relations between their own countries and the peoples of neighboring countries. Modern revisionists, discarding the basic revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, have succeeded to the theories of old revisionists, and they have practically become the tools of old colonialism as well as neo-colonialism. Now modern revisionists have infiltrated their theories into the study of the party history, the history of workers' movements, and that of international relations. They are also engaged in the arbitrary revision of history. In fact the theories of modern revisionists with regard to history are nothing new. They have been taken from the exploiting class. However, they use the label of Marxism to deceive the people. In this way they can all the more easily confuse the minds of the people and produce an effect which could not be produced by the reactionary theories of the capitalist class with regard to history. If their essence were not recognized and their poison eliminated, they would inevitably become an internal corrosive infiltrated into Marxist historiography.

In the realm of historiography we must resolutely carry on an irreconcilable struggle with imperialist, reactionary nationalist, and modern revisionist theories of historiography. Only thus can we recognize the true face of history and elucidate the inevitable laws of historical development. This is a solemn and glorious task imposed on contemporary workers in Marxist historiography.

These workers should, in accordance with the scientific interpretation of history, engage in the strict criticism of the historiographical heritages of all the countries of the world and write scientific history books. We believe that in the age of Mao Tse-tung, under the leadership of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking, our workers in historiography will certainly succeed in fulfilling this historic mission.

## B. Class Struggle on the Historiographical Front

Our criticism of the historiographical heritage of the exploiting class is a struggle for the seizure of the battleground of historiographical theories from the hands of the exploiting class and a constituent part of the struggle for the rise of proletarianism and the destruction of capitalism, i. e., the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism.

In the modern age all kinds of reactionary capitalist thinking on historiography have followed in the wake of imperialism's inroads and combined with the feudal thinking on historiography to form the reactionary historiography of the semi-

colonial and semi-feudal old China. This thinking is a tool for the political struggle of the reactionary ruling circles.

During the Revolution of the New Democracy Marxist revolutionaries, in coordination with the requirements of the then revolutionary struggle, carried on the criticism of the capitalist and feudal historiography, exposed its false and unscientific essence, indicated the regularity of the historical development of society, pointed out the inevitable tendencies of historical development, and guided the broad masses of youths toward the revolution. Some progressive workers in historiography have made certain contributions in this respect. They are doubtless the organic constituent parts of the nationalist and democratic revolutionary movement. This was indeed an important stage in the development of Marxist historiography in our country.

In 1949 our revolution won its victory, the proletariat seized the political power, and Marxism-Leninism became the guiding thought of the country. Thenceforth the Marxist science of history in our country acquired the condition for all-round development.

In the more than a decade that has elapsed, the criticism of our historiographical heritage has made certain contributions. However, some of our workers in historiography have frequently stressed succession and overlooked criticism. Some have even gone so far as to spread the feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography and to attack Marxist historiography.

How has this condition been produced?

Prior to the liberation Marxist historiography was illegal, but capitalist historiography was legal, in the Kuomintang-ruled area. In line with the requirements of the imperialists and the reactionary Kuomintang regime, reactionary historians directly attacked Marxism and opposed the Marxist science of history. Other historians, under the reactionary political pressure, dared not touch politics but pursued their academic studies under the atmosphere of "scholarship for scholarship's sake." While they appeared to be "super-class," how could they be free in practice from the shackles of idealist thinking on history? These people intentionally or unintentionally diffused the feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography in society, in schools, and in academic circles for a long time.

Since the liberation, owing to the drastic changes in society and in politics, the historiographical circles have also undergone change. A great majority of our workers in historiography are willing to study Marxism and many of them have really

made a measure of progress. There are also others who, though they have superficially set aside their anti-Marxist merchandise, have remained unchanged in the depth of their thought. For example, those who regarded Li Tzu-ch'eng (2621 5261 2052) as a roving bandit yesterday cannot but admit that he was a leader of the peasant rebellion; but in their writings they continue in a concealed and round-about way to slander this leader of the peasant rebellion. Those who boosted the way of Ch'eng (4453) and Chu (2612) yesterday cannot but admit that that was feudal Confucianism; but by playing on the so-called "method of abstract succession," they continue to spread the way of Ch'eng and Chu. They are seemingly Marxized, but if a serious analysis of their academic thinking is in fact made, their "Marxization" is confined merely to certain Marxist phraseology.

During the Revolution of the New Democracy, the left wing of the capitalist historians were increasingly dissatisfied with the reactionary rule of the large landlord and capitalist class. Politically they became the allies of the revolution. This positive political factor influenced their academic viewpoints to a certain extent and provided their academic thinking with a certain progressive aura. Though their world conception was still that of the capitalist class, historical studies made by them in certain respects produced some effect at that time. They had of course their part to play in the victory of the Revolution of the New Democracy, and they were of course in the ranks of the victorious forces.

However, we must recognize the victory of the Revolution of the New Democracy, not as that of this or that capitalist theory, but as that of Marxism-Leninism and of Mao Tse-tung's thinking. The victory of the Revolution of the New Democracy opened the new era of the socialist revolution. With the penetration of the socialist revolution, the capitalist thinking on historiography has become the stumbling-block impeding the advance of historiography.

Said Comrade Mao Tse-tung, "Though the socialist transformation of our country, from the standpoint of the ownership system, has been basically completed and the large-scale mass struggle of a stormy nature during the revolutionary era has basically concluded, the remnants of the the landlord and comprador class, which has been overthrown, still exist, the capitalist class is still there, and the petit capitalist class is just being reformed. The class struggle has not yet been concluded. The class struggle between the proletariat and the capitalist class, the class struggle between the various political forces, and the class struggle between the proletariat and the capitalist class in ideology are still protracted, tortuous, and at times even very violent." [See Note]

Note: "Concerning the Question of Correctly Dealing with the People's Internal Contradictions," Mao Tse-tung Chu-tso Hsuan-tu (Chia-chung Pen) Selections from Mao Tse-tung's Works (ed A), People's Publishing Agency, 1965, 2d ed, page 482.

In the science of history endowed with a high degree of party character, the struggle between the two roads of the proletariat and the capitalist class and the struggle between the proletarians' materialist conception of history and the capitalists' idealist conception of history are also protracted, tortuous, and at times even very violent.

The historiography of the exploiting class has had a long history. This historiography and its soul, the idealist conception of history, cannot of itself die a natural death as a result of the victory of the revolution. Historians who insist on the capitalist standpoint must necessarily take all measures to attack Marxist historiography. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat they cannot openly oppose Marxism, but under the cloak of Marxism they distort it. They support Marxism in form but oppose it in fact.

Looking back over the development of historiography in the last decade or more, we find that the forms adopted by the above-mentioned struggles were frequently different in different stages. During the initial period after the liberation the right wing of the capitalist historians were naturally compelled by the prowess of the victorious revolution to cast aside their extremely idealist and reactionary thinking, to wait quietly for the expected change. As the right wing of the capitalist class attacked the party, a minority of the right wing of the capitalist historians became very arrogant. Through the counterattack on the right wing of the capitalist class, through the criticism of the academic studies of that class, and through the criticism of the capitalist thinking on historiography, especially of the "stress of the ancient and belittlement of the modern," a preliminary exposure was made of the ideological face of reactionary historiography and there was a preliminary recognition of the class struggle reflected in this science, hence the diminution of the market for the reactionary thinking on historiography.

Subsequently our historiographical work had some development. Especially our revolutionary young workers in historiography, under the party's leadership and encouragement, were bold enough to ignore emperors, kings, commanders-in-chief, and prime ministers of former ages, to overthrow the feudal dynastic systems of imperial family-trees, to eulogize the working people in history, and to declare war on the historiographical traditions of the capitalist class. This spirit of striving to restudy and

rewrite history in its entirety, this spirit of being courageous enough to engage in the revolution and to struggle is indeed extremely precious.

Under these circumstances the right wing of capitalist historians would hesitate to oppose openly the party's academic policies or to counter Marxism openly with the theories of extreme idealism. They frequently make a gesture of supporting the party's academic policies but do their best to lean toward the right and even adopt the dual trick of openly complying but secretly dissenting. When the leadership rectifies mistakes in academic studies made within its own ranks, the above-mentioned capitalist historians do their best to exaggerate certain of these mistakes, seeking to deny totally the party's class policies and the Marxist criticisms of capitalist historiography.

At this stage the majority of the right wing of capitalist historians did not adopt the formula of the extreme idealist conception of history, but participated in the academic controversies as Marxist historiographical theorists. Superficially they resorted to the phraseology of classical writers, but in fact they sought to deprive Marxist theories of their revolutionary nuclei. Their words were very persuasive, but their intentions very unseemly.

Between 1959 and 1962, owing to the destructive activities of modern revisionists and the serious natural calamities, we encountered temporary economic difficulties. During this period a large number of ugly monsters made their appearance, and the class struggle in the realm of historiography became acute. For several years there raged the struggle between the two roads of the proletariat and the capitalist class, in dealing with the party's academic policies, in many controversies on questions of historiography, and in the method of academic study.

In the study of history, as in other academic fields, we adopted the plan of "the contention of a hundred schools of thought," with a view to clarifying right and wrong through recurrent debate gradually, developing the Marxist science of history, and eliminating step by step the feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography. This is an unshakable, positive, and proletarian class policy. On the part of the capitalist historians, however, they sought to convert this policy into one of setting the capitalist class free. However they "contended," they could not be criticized. If you criticized them, it "interfered" with their "contention," it was tantamount to prohibiting them from "contending," and it contravened the proposition of "letting a hundred schools of thought contend." Did not an ideological class struggle exist here?

We have always treasured the historiographical heritage of the fatherland, but we say that there must be criticism, through which we can hope to get the cream. However, capitalist historians view criticism as "nihilism," as disregard of the heritage. If you talk about succession, they claim, "succession to us is succession to the heritage." These historians are bent on opposing criticism and seek to smuggle the ideology of the exploiting class into Marxist historiography. The depths of the souls of these historians are filled with the feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography. Are not those who pay fervent homage to the idol of Confucius typical examples?

Different schools of scientific thought have indeed the freedom of debate, and no one has the right to undermine new and reasonable views. Of course, in historiographical circles, any new judgments and new viewpoints with regard to the application of Marxism-Leninism to the survey of historical problems inevitably conflict with other judgments and viewpoints which are older. The new judgments and viewpoints are frequently produced by the struggle of criticizing and negating old ones. It is doubtless a normal phenomenon to involve a certain group of people whenever there is a free theoretical controversy. However, certain capitalist historians, on the basis of the traditions and habits of old academic circles, tend to be suspicious and make unwarranted conjectures with regard to the attacks of certain people on certain other people and of certain schools of thought on certain other schools. They use the scheming sectarian sentiments of the old society to distort academic disputes of principle between right and wrong, and they spread rumors, seeking to convert scientific debates as to right and wrong into vulgar personal squabbles. Making use of certain dissensions with regard to the interpretation of policy or historical theory, they stir up disharmony between certain parties and force the mean tricks of the old academic circles into present-day historiographical circles. Are they not using this means to attack the left wing and disintegrate the revolutionary ranks of historiography?

Certain capitalist historians seek to monopolize the historiographical forum. They blindly crown themselves as authorities and dominate historiographical circles. Under the control of sectarian sentiments, they show their arrogance by declaring, "Those whom we love are expected to live, and those whom we detest, to die," and "Those who are for us prosper and those who are against us die." Their spearheads are pointed especially at our young workers in historiography, freely slandering them as "puerile," "ignorant," and "vague" and as "exploders" destroying "great constructive work." They seek to beat down with this trick our revolutionary young workers in historiography. On the

other hand the minority of youths who follow closely in their footsteps are regarded by them as geniuses, on whom their hope is pinned. They are greatly boosted and endlessly praised and are trained as revolutionary successors.

We advocate the "guidance of history by theory." That is to say, we must study history with the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking, make a scientific analysis of large masses of historical facts, and oppose the capitalist conception of history that "historical facts should be for the sake of historical facts" and that "historical material is history." This is very clear policy. However, some capitalist historians distort the "guidance of history by theory" into the "substitution of history by theory" and attack the former violently. They place theory and historical fact in opposite positions. Nominally they "respect historical facts," but in fact they practice their belief that "historical material is history." They one-sidedly exaggerate the role of "research," seeking to boycott Marxist theories with research. Is their object here not to eliminate the guidance of the science of history with Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking?

The unification of a high degree of revolutionary character and a high degree of scientific character is an inherent characteristic of Marxism. But certain capitalist historians split revolutionary and scientific character. They assert that now "there is only revolutionary character and no scientific character," and that "there is either revolutionary or scientific character." Let us ask, Away from the revolutionary theories of Marxism what scientific history is there? Is this not resistance to Marxism?

We say that the class viewpoint is the nucleus of historical materialism and that in the study of the history of society there must be class analysis, the concrete analysis of class contradictions and the class struggle. Certain historians say, however, "Class analysis is not a panacea" and "the study of primitive history does not require class analysis," seeking to deny that class analysis is the basic method for studying social history. Let us ask, Can we apply the so-called super-class viewpoint to the study of the history of a class society? Is not the slander of the working people in history books for generations not the class viewpoint of the exploiting class? Let us ask, Without understanding the theories of Marxism and without applying Marxism to class analysis, how can we understand the true process of primitive society from its condition without classes to one with classes?

A historian has satirized the manuscript of a book on

history by saying that "it flatters every peasant and deals every landlord a blow," regarding this as a crime. It is surprising that such a criticism emanated from someone who spoke of himself as a Marxist historian. We want to ask if it is not right for you to "flatter every peasant and deal every landlord a blow."

These self-styled Marxist historians have come out to fight for the defense of emperors, kings, commanders-in-chief, and prime ministers, for the rectification of "bad school discipline," and for opposing "anti-historicism." As a result a series of forums and report sessions have been held, and a series of articles by so-called historiographical theorists have been published. They have done their best to glorify emperors, kings, commanders-in-chief, and prime ministers, whom they regard as being capable of only being glorified and not criticized. Whoever criticizes them is guilty of "nihilism" and "anti-historicism." Peasants in history have become the targets of their slanders. First they say that peasants were backward and that all they wanted was to become rich and become emperors; secondly, that the peasant rebellion lacked its own thinking and was not opposed to the landlord class or the feudal system; and thirdly, that peasants were violent and killed too many people, frequently creating epidemics and the split of society. In a word, emperors, kings, commanders-in-chief, and prime ministers were the "bright side" and peasants the "dark side" of history. This is what they call "historicism."

The examples are innumerable. Is this recurrent phenomenon in historiography as a whole not a true fact?

Should our revolutionary workers in historiography let all this reactionary thinking of the capitalist class on historiography spread far and wide? Of course not. With this in view a series of sharp controversies in principle have been launched in historiographical circles. On the question of class viewpoint and historicism, on that of the peasant war, and on that of whether feudal morality can be handed down and of the appraisal of historical personages, our revolutionary workers in historiography have commenced a counterattack on the anti-Marxist viewpoint. This is exactly an ideological class struggle.

With the change of the times and of the situation of the struggle, the theories and thinking of certain historians of the left wing in the past have come to a standstill and become increasingly paralyzed; and latent old thinking and old behavior are rearing their heads and have had greater and greater development. Carried away by the flattery from different quarters and by their apparent success, they have regarded themselves as "ab-

solutely correct." Thus they have been silently transformed and without their knowing it, they have entered the labyrinth of "peaceful evolution." They have become the captives of the feudal and capitalist class on historiography and the voluntary propagandists and salesmen of the historiographical thinking and behavior of the capitalist class. They commit acts which "hurt their intimates and please their enemies" and which "boost the power of the capitalist class and undermine the will of the proletariat."

During the Revolution of the New Democracy historiographical workers of the left wing carried on a struggle with reactionary historians and made some contributions. However, we must not credit to ourselves all these contributions and we must not think that the victory of the revolution proved the total correctness of our historiographical theories at that time and their full Marxist nature. We should perspire, if we reread all our past writings and seriously reexamine our historiographical theories.

In the socialist revolution historians of the left wing should have been able to spread the excellent traditions of the revolution far and wide, form a central force, help our young workers in historiography, and drive ahead effectively the advance of our historiography. However, some people did not seek to spread the traditions of the revolution and developed their latent feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography. They went in the opposite direction and dragged our young workers in historiography toward the right. Is this not worthy of our strict vigilance? If this arbitrariness were permitted to continue, we would inevitably tumble into the abyss of revisionism.

If we do not clear the minds of our workers in historiography of the capitalist and feudal thinking and permit it to continue its mischief, it is futile to speak of any Marxist criticism of our historiographical heritage. In this way we would only succeed to capitalist and feudal historiography, and there would only be uncritical succession. How can we speak of the restudy and rewriting of history in its entirety?

If the world outlook of our workers in historiography were not thoroughly transformed and turned from the capitalist to the proletarian direction, no matter how many Marxist sayings we could commit to memory, we would not be able to leap out of the quagmire of capitalist historiography.

### C. We Must Restudy Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's Thinking

In our view, to become real Marxist workers in historiog-

raphy, we must first of all carry on a thorough self-criticism and self-revolution in thinking. To this end, we must make a restudy of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking. Only by really holding in our hands the critical weapons of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking can we make a thorough criticism of our historiographical heritage and play the role we should in the revolutionary struggle in historiography.

Whenever the word "study" is mentioned, some workers in historiography look at it very lightly, as they have the feeling that they have successfully acquired the habit of reading and that it is comparatively easy for them to sit down and do it. Thus the vitality of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking is all lost in their hands. What they are after is not the spiritual substance of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking, but they adopt the pedantic attitude of stressing each word and each phrase in the text and try to find the basis for their fixed ideas in classical writings. Although these people have read some books on Marxism, in fact they "have not read into them, the reading matter has not taken root in their minds, they cannot apply it, and theirs is still the old class feeling." [See Note] This attitude toward Marxism is definitely not proletarian attitude, but that of capitalist intellectuals.

[Note]: "Talk at the National Conference of the Chinese Communist Party on Propaganda Work," op cit, page 505.

Historiography is a science with a high degree of class character. If our attitude were not transformed and our class feeling not turned from the side of the exploiting class to that of the proletariat, and if we did not have a full and burning revolutionary will, no matter how many times we read the classical works and how many index cards we kept--it might be 10,000--, we would not become real Marxist workers in historiography.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has asked workers in art and literature to "stand on the side of the proletariat and the masses of the people. So far as members of the Communist party are concerned, they should stand on the side of the party, class character, and class policies." [See Note]

[Note]: "Talk at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art," Mao Tse-tung Hsuan-chi (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung), Vol III, People's Publishing Agency, 1953, 2d ed, page 850.

Can we say that the question of the attitude of our workers in historiography has already been correctly solved?

No, we cannot. Some people quote verbally from Marxism, but the depths of their souls are still in the kingdom of capitalist intellectuals and even retain the old habits of feudal scholars. If this thinking and feeling were not changed, they would still be filled with the memories of emperors, kings, commanders-in-chief, and prime ministers as well as literary men, without a trace of the working people. How could they write the true history of the working people? How could they really study Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking?

Comrade Mao has said, "The great majority of our intellectuals of today have sprung from the old society and the families of non-working people. Though some may have come from the families of workers and peasants, what they had received before the liberation was capitalist education, their world outlook was basically that of the capitalist class, and they were intellectuals belonging to the capitalist class. If these people do not get rid of their past and change into the proletarian world conception, their viewpoint, attitude, and feeling will differ from those of the worker and peasant, they will not be able to get along with workers and peasants, and the latter will not speak to them from their hearts." [See Note]

[Note]: "Talk at the National Conference of the Chinese Communist Party on Propaganda Work," op cit, page 508.

If they do not have a common attitude and feeling with the working people, it is difficult for them to understand the truth that "history has been created by the working people." Under the control of the attitude and feeling of the exploiting class, it is impossible to write the history of the working people, but what is sought can only be fame, position, remuneration for contributions to publications, living, and even the "protection," with the help of some friends, of what they call their "theories."

As Comrade Mao Tse-tung aptly put it, our thinking and feeling must "undergo change and transformation," "we must change from one class to another," and "without this change, without this transformation, nothing can be accomplished, and everything is inaccessible." [See Note]

[Note]: "Talk at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art," op cit, page 853.

If our workers in historiography really wish their attitude, viewpoint, thinking, and feeling to undergo change and really desire to turn from the side of the capitalist class to that of the proletariat, they must join the flamboyant class

struggle and the practical production struggle.

Now that the movement of socialist education is going on in the whole country, our workers in historiography should actively participate in it. We should organize ourselves to go down to the basic strata, live and work together with the working people, learn from them with humility, and test and forge ourselves in the reality of the mass class struggle, so that we can really understand the greatness of labor and the working people and concretely recognize the truth that social development is pushed ahead by the class struggle. Only thus can we comprehend the process of the creation of history by the working people.

When we maintain close ties with the masses of workers and peasants in our actual living, our feeling will gradually undergo change. In this way we can all "have a common language, a common language not only in patriotism, not only in the system of socialism, but in the Communist world conception." [See Note 17] Only thus can we "convert the Marxism which we learn from books into something our own." [See Note 27]

[Note 17]: "Talk at the National Conference of the Chinese Communist Party on Propaganda Work," op cit, pages 508-509.

[Note 27]: Ibid, page 508.

In so doing, do we tend to affect our own work? That depends on how we look at the work of historiography. Since the latter is an important battleground in the ideological struggle between the proletariat and the capitalist class, since in the development of historiography there exists the struggle between the two roads of the proletariat and the capitalist class, to seize and consolidate this battleground, we must have a truly Marxist army of historiography. This army can only be formed in the reality of revolution and in the class struggle. We should comprehend that basically speaking, the work of historiography is to carry on the class struggle theoretically. Only by understanding the class struggle of the proletariat and by having in the depth of his thought a full will to the proletarian class struggle can a Marxist worker in historiography be said to have a soul for this work. Not only will this not delay the work, but on the contrary, it will strengthen the most important links of this work.

"Our task!" Yes, as cadres of theoretical work, we should seriously fulfill the task assigned to us by the party and state. When we look back over the more than a decade which has elapsed, we feel that we have truly done a great deal,

trained a large number of cadres for the work of historiography, written quite a few works, and conducted a theoretical struggle in our work. However, if we make a careful examination, how have we fulfilled our tasks? To what extent has the army of historiography been Marxized? In those works just mentioned, how much Marxism is there? Is this not worthy of our deep thought? If we do not transform our attitude, viewpoint, thinking, and feeling thoroughly, the tasks of Marxist historiography cannot be fulfilled. If we go on half-heartedly, it will be greatly worth our while to consider for which class we are fulfilling our tasks.

We have absolutely no objection to the statement that "we have to study." On the contrary, we advocate real study. But we are opposed to the static and isolated method of studying and to the bookworm's attitude of "studying for the sake of studying." The latter would only lead to ignorance and haziness.

As we see it, the first thing is to read the live book contained in the realistic class struggle. This is a book really worth reading. Although not yet written up and bound into a book, it contains the description of the attitude, viewpoint, and feeling of each class and each individual in the social struggle which has been written up in their words and in their actions. This is a book putting the theories of the Marxist class struggle together with the realistic class struggle itself. It is live Marxism. Only by understanding this "live book" can we convert the Marxism which we learn from books into something our own and verbal Marxism into live Marxism enacted in the realistic struggle.

Only after we have studied through this "live book" is it possible to read the books which have already been written up and to discover from the voluminous old history books the great deeds of the working people in creating history and the important role of their generations of class struggle in pushing ahead the development of history.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said that young people "are quite like the sun at 8:00 or 9:00 in the morning. Our hope is pinned on you." [See Note] Our young workers in historiography should assume an especially important responsibility in the difficult historiographical revolution. Therefore they need all the more the serious study of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking, and they should forge themselves in the realistic class struggle. The present movement of socialist education is precisely a class struggle in the course of the development of the socialist society. It is a significant revolutionary movement.

It is a new proposition in the development of Marxist theories. It is a new revolutionary task imposed by the new reality of society. We must press forward and forge and transform ourselves, in the course of this flamboyant class struggle, into strong revolutionary fighters on the historiographical front for the rise of proletarianism and the destruction of capitalism.

Note: Mao Chu-hsi tsai Su-lien ti Yen-lun (Chairman Mao's Statements in the Soviet Union), People's Publishing Agency, 1959, 2d ed, page 14.

Participation in the class struggle is the long-term plan for training red workers in historiography.

The primary step of restudying Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking is to start from the reality of society and from the participation in the realistic class struggle. The participation of workers in historiography in the realistic social struggle is precisely scientific experimentation in the science of history. A single participation cannot last for a whole lifetime. From now on it is necessary to participate in the realistic social struggle at given intervals.

The objects of our restudy of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thinking are to recognize and transform ourselves, understand the status quo of historiography, transform it, and carry on its revolution.

The criticism of feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography and the conduct of the revolution in historiography constitute a matter of importance. The latter is a constituent part of the socialist revolution, and it concerns the thorough elimination of the influence of feudal and capitalist thinking. The feudal and capitalist thinking on historiography is a potential for the restoration of capitalism, and it can be eliminated only by the thorough conduct of the revolution in historiography.

We must carry the revolution in historiography to the very end!

6096  
CSO: 3530-D

- END -