

Jason
DS701
H931+

JPRS: 36,669

TT: 66-33100

25 July 1966

TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNG-CH'I (RED FLAG)
No 9, 1966
- Communist China -
No. 33

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 9, 1966

- Communist China -

No. 33

This serial publication contains translations of all of the articles from the Chinese-language periodical Hung-Ch'i (Red Flag), No 9, 1966. Complete bibliographic information accompanies each article.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art -- May 1942	1
Trust the Masses, Rely on the Masses	27
The Compass for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution -- Note on the Reprinting of "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art"	31
Thoroughly Criticize and Repudiate the Revisionist Line of Some of the Principal Leading Members of the Former Peking Municipal Party Committee	34
Chou Yang's Black Arrow to Turn History Upside Down -- Comment on a Note in the <u>Complete Works of Lu Hsun</u> , Vol. VI	41
"National Defense Literature" is a Slogan of Wang Ming's Right Opportunist Line	58

TALKS AT THE YENAN FORUM ON LITERATURE
AND ART -- MAY 1942

[Following is a translation of a reprint of a speech by
Mao Tse-tung in the Chinese-language periodical Hung-ch'i
(Red Flag), No. 9, 1 July 1966.]

INTRODUCTION

May 2, 1942

Comrades! You have been invited to this forum today to exchange ideas and examine the relationship between work in the literary and artistic fields and revolutionary work in general. Our aim is to ensure that revolutionary literature and art follow the correct path of development and provide better help to other revolutionary work in facilitating the overthrow of our national enemy and the accomplishment of the task of national liberation.

In our struggle for the liberation of the Chinese people there are various fronts, among which there are the fronts of the pen and of the gun, the cultural and the military fronts. To defeat the enemy we must rely primarily on the army with guns. But this army alone is not enough; we must also have a cultural army, which is absolutely indispensable for uniting our own ranks and defeating the enemy. Since the May 4th Movement such a cultural army has taken shape in China, and it has helped the Chinese revolution, gradually reduced the domain of China's feudal culture and of the comprador culture which serves imperialist aggression, and weakened their influence. To oppose the new culture the Chinese reactionaries can now only "pit quantity against quality". In other words, reactionaries have money, and though they can produce nothing good, they can go all out and produce in quantity. Literature and art have been an important and successful part of the cultural front since the May 4th Movement. During the ten years' civil war, the revolutionary literature and art movement grew greatly. That movement and the revolutionary war both headed in the same general direction, but these two fraternal armies were not linked together in their practical work because the reactionaries had cut them off from each other. It is very good that since the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against

Japan, more and more revolutionary writers and artists have been coming to Yen-an and our other anti-Japanese base areas. But it does not necessarily follow that, having come to the base areas, they have already integrated themselves completely with the masses of the people here. The two must be completely integrated if we are to push ahead with our revolutionary work. The purpose of our meeting today is precisely to ensure that literature and art fit well into the whole revolutionary machine as a component part, that they operate as powerful weapons for uniting and educating the people and for attacking and destroying the enemy, and that they help the people fight the enemy with one heart and one mind. What are the problems that must be solved to achieve this objective? I think they are the problems of the class stand of the writers and artists, their attitude, their audience, their work and their study.

The problem of class stand. Our stand is that of the proletariat and of the masses. For members of the Communist Party, this means keeping to the stand of the Party, keeping to Party spirit and Party policy. Are there any of our literary and art workers who are still mistaken or not clear in their understanding of this problem? I think there are. Many of our comrades have frequently departed from the correct stand.

The problem of attitude. From one's stand there follow specific attitudes towards specific matters. For instance, is one to extol or to expose? This is a question of attitude. Which attitude is wanted? I would say both. The question is, whom are you dealing with? There are three kinds of persons, the enemy, our allies in the united front and our own people; the last are the masses and their vanguard. We need to adopt a different attitude towards each of the three. With regard to the enemy, that is, Japanese imperialism and all the other enemies of the people, the task of revolutionary writers and artists is to expose their duplicity and cruelty and at the same time to point out the inevitability of their defeat, so as to encourage the anti-Japanese army and people to fight staunchly with one heart and one mind for their overthrow. With regard to our different allies in the united front, our attitude should be one of both alliance and criticism, and there should be different kinds of alliance and different kinds of criticism. We support them in their resistance to Japan and praise them for any achievement. But if they are not active in the War of Resistance, we should criticize them. If anyone opposes the Communist Party and the people and keeps moving down the path of reaction, we will firmly oppose him. As for the masses of the people, their toil and their struggle, their army and their Party, we should certainly praise them. The people, too, have their shortcomings. Among the proletariat many retain petty-bourgeois ideas, while both the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie have backward ideas; these are burdens hampering them in their struggle. We should be patient and spend a long time in educating them and helping them to get these loads off their backs and combat their own shortcomings

and errors, so that they can advance with great strides. They have remoulded themselves in struggle or are doing so, and our literature and art should depict this process. As long as they do not persist in their errors, we should not dwell on their negative side and consequently make the mistake of ridiculing them or, worse still, of being hostile to them. Our writings should help them to unite, to make progress, to press ahead with one heart and one mind, to discard what is backward and develop what is revolutionary, and should certainly not do the opposite.

The problem of audience, i.e., the people for whom our works of literature and art are produced. In the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region and the anti-Japanese base areas of northern and central China, this problem differs from that in the Kuomintang areas, and differs still more from that in Shanghai before the War of Resistance. In the Shanghai period, the audience for works of revolutionary literature and art consisted mainly of a section of the students, office workers and shop assistants. After the outbreak of the War of Resistance the audience in the Kuomintang areas became somewhat wider, but it still consisted mainly of the same kind of people because the government there prevented the workers, peasants and soldiers from having access to revolutionary literature and art. In our base areas the situation is entirely different. Here the audience for works of literature and art consists of workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary cadres. There are students in the base areas, too, but they are different from students of the old type; they are either former or future cadres. The cadres of all types, fighters in the army, workers in the factories and peasants in the villages all want to read books and newspapers once they become literate, and those who are illiterate want to see plays and operas, look at drawings and paintings, sing songs and hear music; they are the audience for our works of literature and art. Take the cadres alone. Do not think they are few; they far outnumber the readers of any book published in the Kuomintang areas. There, an edition usually runs to only 2,000 copies, and even three editions add up to only 6,000; but as for the cadres in the base areas, in Yen-an alone there are more than 10,000 who read books. Many of them, moreover, are tempered revolutionaries of long standing, who have come from all parts of the country and will go out to work in different places, so it is very important to do educational work among them. Our literary and art workers must do a good job in this respect.

Since the audience for our literature and art consists of workers, peasants and soldiers and of their cadres, the problem arises of understanding them and knowing them well. A great deal of work has to be done in order to understand them and know them well, to understand and know well all the different kinds of people and phenomena in the Party and government organizations, in the villages and factories and in the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies. Our writers and artists have their literary and art work to do, but their primary task is to understand people and know them well. In this regard, how have matters stood with

our writers and artists? I would say they have been lacking in knowledge and understanding; they have been like "a hero with no place to display his prowess". What does lacking a knowledge mean? Not knowing people well. The writers and artists do not have a good knowledge either of those whom they describe or of their audience; indeed they may hardly know them at all. They do not know the workers or peasants or soldiers well, and do not know the cadres well either. What does lacking in understanding mean? Not understanding the language, that is, not being familiar with the rich, lively language of the masses. Since many writers and artists stand aloof from the masses and lead empty lives, naturally they are unfamiliar with the language of the people. Accordingly, their works are not only insipid in language but often contain nondescript expressions of their own coining which run counter to popular usage. Many comrades like to talk about "a mass style". But what does it really mean? It means that the thoughts and feelings of our writers and artists should be fused with those of the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers. To achieve this fusion, they should conscientiously learn the language of the masses. How can you talk of literary and artistic creation if you find the very language of the masses largely incomprehensible? By "a hero with no place to display his prowess", we mean that your collection of great truths is not appreciated by the masses. The more you put on the airs of a veteran before the masses and play the "hero", the more you try to peddle such stuff to the masses, the less likely they are to accept it. If you want the masses to understand you, if you want to be one with the masses, you must make up your mind to undergo a long and even painful process of tempering. Here I might mention the experience of how my own feelings changed. I began life as a student and at school acquired the ways of a student; I then used to feel it undignified to do even a little manual labour, such as carrying my own luggage in the presence of my fellow students, who were incapable of carrying anything, either on their shoulders or in their hands. At that time I felt that intellectuals were the only clean people in the world, while in comparison workers and peasants were dirty. I did not mind wearing the clothes of other intellectuals, believing them clean, but I would not put on clothes belonging to a worker or peasant, believing them dirty. But after I became a revolutionary and lived with workers and peasants and with soldiers of the revolutionary army, I gradually came to know them well, and they gradually came to know me well too. It was then, and only then, that I fundamentally changed the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois feelings implanted in me in the bourgeois schools. I came to feel that compared with the workers and peasants the unremoulded intellectuals were not clean and that in the last analysis, the workers and peasants were the cleanest people and, even though their hands were soiled and their feet smeared with cow-dung, they were really cleaner than the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals. That is what is meant by a change in feelings, a change from one class to another. If our writers and artists who come from the intelligentsia want their works to be well received by the masses, they must change and remould

their thinking and their feelings. Without such a change, without such remoulding, they can do nothing well and will be misfits.

The last problem is study, by which I mean the study of Marxism-Leninism and of society. Anyone who considers himself a revolutionary Marxist writer, and especially any writer who is a member of the Communist Party, must have a knowledge of Marxism-Leninism. At present, however, some comrades are lacking in the basic concepts of Marxism. For instance, it is a basic Marxist concept that being determines consciousness, that the objective realities of class struggle and national struggle determine our thoughts and feelings. But some of our comrades turn this upside down and maintain that everything ought to start from "love". Now as for love, in a class society there can be only class love; but these comrades are seeking a love transcending classes, love in the abstract and also freedom in the abstract, truth in the abstract, human nature in the abstract, etc. This shows that they have been very deeply influenced by the bourgeoisie. They should thoroughly rid themselves of this influence and modestly study Marxism-Leninism. It is right for writers and artists to study literary and artistic creation, but the science of Marxism-Leninism must be studied by all revolutionaries, writers and artists not excepted. Writers and artists should study society, that is to say, should study the various classes in society, their mutual relations and respective conditions, their physiognomy and their psychology. Only when we grasp all this clearly can we have a literature and art that is rich in content and correct in orientation.

I am merely raising these problems today by way of introduction; I hope all of you will express your views on these and other relevant problems.

CONCLUSION

May 23, 1942

Comrades! Our forum has had three meetings this month. In the pursuit of truth we have carried on spirited debates in which scores of Party and non-Party comrades have spoken, laying bare the issues and making them more concrete. This I believe, will very much benefit the whole literary and artistic movement.

In discussing a problem, we should start from reality and not from definitions. We would be following a wrong method if we first looked up definitions of literature and art in textbooks and then used them to determine the guiding principles for the present-day literary and artistic movement and to judge the different opinions and controversies that arise today. We are Marxists, and Marxism teaches that in our approach to a problem we should start from objective facts, not

from abstract definitions, and that we should derive our guiding principles, policies and measures from an analysis of these facts. We should do the same in our present discussion of literary and artistic work.

What are the facts at present? The facts are: the War of Resistance Against Japan which China has been fighting for five years; the world-wide anti-fascist war; the vacillations of China's big landlord class and big bourgeoisie in the War of Resistance and their policy of high-handed oppression of the people; the revolutionary movement in literature and art since the May 4th Movement -- its great contributions to the revolution during the last twenty-three years and its many shortcomings; the anti-Japanese democratic base areas of the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and the integration of large numbers of writers and artists with these armies and with the workers and peasants in these areas; the difference in both environment and tasks between the writers and artists in the base areas and those in the Kuomintang areas; and the controversial issues concerning literature and art which have arisen in Yen-an and the other anti-Japanese base areas. These are the actual, undeniable facts in the light of which we have to consider our problems.

What then is the crux of the matter? In my opinion, it consists fundamentally of the problems of working for the masses and how to work for the masses. Unless these two problems are solved, or solved properly, our writers and artists will be ill-adapted to their environment and their tasks and will come up against a series of difficulties from without and within. My concluding remarks will centre on these two problems and also touch upon some related ones.

I

The first problem is: literature and art from whom?

This problem was solved long ago by Marxists, especially by Lenin. As far back as 1905 Lenin pointed out emphatically that our literature and art should "serve...the millions and tens of millions of working people" [see Note 1]. For comrades engaged in literary and artistic work in the anti-Japanese base areas it might seem that this problem is already solved and needs no further discussion. Actually, that is not the case. Many comrades have not found a clear solution. Consequently their sentiments, their works, their actions and their views on the guiding principles for literature and art have inevitably been more or less at variance with the needs of the masses and of the practical struggle. Of course, among the numerous men of culture, writers, artists and other literary and artistic workers engaged in the great struggle for liberation together with the Communist Party and the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies, a few may be careerists who are with us only temporarily, but the overwhelming majority are working energetically for

the common cause. By relying on these comrades, we have achieved a great deal in our literature, drama, music and fine arts. Many of these writers and artists have begun their work since the outbreak of the War of Resistance; many others did much revolutionary work before the war, endured many hardships and influenced broad masses of the people by their activities and works. Why do we say, then, that even among these comrades there are some who have not reached a clear solution of the problem of whom literature and art are for? Is it conceivable that there are still some who maintain that revolutionary literature and art are not for the masses of the people but for the exploiters and oppressors?

(Note 1: See V. I. Lenin, "Party Organization and Party Literature", in which he described the characteristics of proletarian literature as follows:

It will be a free literature, because the idea of socialism and sympathy with the working people, and not greed or careerism, will bring ever new forces to its ranks. It will be a free literature, because it will serve, not some satiated heroine, not the bored "upper ten thousand" suffering from fatty degeneration, but the millions and tens of millions of working people -- the flower of the country, its strength and its future. It will be a free literature, enriching the last word in the revolutionary thought of mankind with the experience and living work of the socialist proletariat, bringing about permanent interaction between the experience of the past (scientific socialism, the completion of the development of socialism from its primitive, utopian forms) and the experience of the present (the present struggle of the worker comrades). (Collected Works, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. X, pp. 48-49.))

Indeed literature and art exist which are for the exploiters and oppressors. Literature and art for the landlord class are feudal literature and art. Such were the literature and art of the ruling class in China's feudal era. To this day such literature and art still have considerable influence in China. Literature and art for the bourgeoisie are bourgeois literature and art. People like Liang Shih-chiu [see Note 2], whom Lu Hsun criticized, talk about literature and art as transcending classes, but in fact they uphold bourgeois literature and art and oppose proletarian literature and art. Then literature and art exist which serve the imperialists -- for example, the works of Chou Tso-jen, Chang Tzu-ping [see Note 3], and their like -- which we call traitor literature and art. With us, literature and art are for the people, not for any of the above groups. We have said that China's new culture at the present stage is an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture of the masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat. Today, anything that is truly of the masses must necessarily be led by the proletariat. Whatever is under the leadership of the bourgeoisie cannot possibly be of the

masses. Naturally, the same applies to the new literature and art which are part of the new culture. We should take over the rich legacy and the good traditions in literature and art that have been handed down from past ages in China and foreign countries, but the aim must still be to serve the masses of the people. Nor do we refuse to utilize the literary and artistic forms of the past, but in our hands these old forms, remoulded and infused with new content, also become something revolutionary in the service of the people.

(Note 2: Liang Shih-chiu, a member of the counter-revolutionary National Socialist Party, for a long time propagated reactionary American bourgeois ideas on literature and art. He stubbornly opposed the revolution and reviled revolutionary literature and art.

Note 3: Chou Tso-jen and Chang Tzu-ping capitulated to the Japanese aggressors after the Japanese occupied Peking and Shanghai in 1937.)

Who, then, are the masses of the people? The broadest sections of the people, constituting more than 90 percent of our total population, are the workers, peasants, soldiers and urban petty bourgeoisie. Therefore, our literature and art are first for the workers, the class that leads the revolution. Secondly, they are for the peasants, the most numerous and most steadfast of our allies in the revolution. Thirdly, they are for the armed workers and peasants, namely, the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and the other armed units of the people, which are the main forces of the revolutionary war. Fourthly, they are for the labouring masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie and for the petty-bourgeois intellectuals, both of whom are also our allies in the revolution and capable of long-term co-operation with us. These four kinds of people constitute the overwhelming majority of the Chinese nation, the broadest masses of the people.

Our literature and art should be for the four kinds of people we have enumerated. To serve them, we must take the class stand of the proletariat and not that of the petty bourgeoisie. Today, writers who cling to an individualist, petty-bourgeois stand cannot truly serve the masses of revolutionary workers, peasants and soldiers. Their interest is mainly focused on the small number of petty-bourgeois intellectuals. This is the crucial reason why some of our comrades cannot correctly solve the problem of "for whom?" In saying this I am not referring to theory. In theory, or in words, no one in our ranks regards the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers as less important than the petty-bourgeois intellectuals. I am referring to practice, to action. In practice, in action, do they regard petty-bourgeois intellectuals as more important than workers, peasants and soldiers? I think they do. Many comrades concern themselves with studying the petty-bourgeois intellectuals and analysing their psychology, and they concentrate on portraying these

intellectuals and excusing or defending their shortcomings, instead of guiding the intellectuals to join with them in getting closer to the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, taking part in the practical struggles of the masses, portraying and educating the masses. Coming from the petty bourgeoisie and being themselves intellectuals, many comrades seek friends only among intellectuals and concentrate on studying and describing them. Such study and description are proper if done from a proletarian position. But that is not what they do, or not what they do fully. They take the petty-bourgeois stand and produce works that are the self-expression of the petty bourgeoisie, as can be seen in quite a number of literary and artistic products. Often they show heartfelt sympathy for intellectuals of petty-bourgeois origin, to the extent of sympathizing with or even praising their shortcomings. On the other hand, these comrades seldom come into contact with the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, do not understand or study them, do not have intimate friends among them and are not good at portraying them; when they do depict them, the clothes are the clothes of working people but the faces are those of petty-bourgeois intellectuals. In certain respects they are fond of the workers, peasants and soldiers and the cadres stemming from them; but there are times when they do not like them and there are some respects in which they do not like them; they do not like their feelings or their manner of their nascent literature and art (the wall newspapers, murals, folk songs, folk tales, etc.). At times they are fond of these things too, but that is when they are hunting for novelty, for something with which to embellish their own works, or even for certain backward features. At other times they openly despise these things and are partial to what belongs to the petty-bourgeois intellectuals or even to the bourgeoisie. These comrades have their feet planted on the side of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals; or, to put it more elegantly, their innermost soul is still a kingdom of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. Thus they have not yet solved, or not yet clearly solved, the problem of "for whom?" This applies not only to newcomers to Yenan; even among comrades who have been to the front and worked for a number of years in our base areas and in the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies, many have not completely solved this problem. It requires a long period of time, at least eight or ten years, to solve it thoroughly. But however long it takes, solve it we must and solve it unequivocally and thoroughly. Our literary and art workers must accomplish this task and shift their stand; they must gradually move their feet over to the side of the workers, peasants and soldiers, to the side of the proletariat, through the process of going into their very midst and into the thick of practical struggles and through the process of studying Marxism and society. Only in this way can we have a literature and art that are truly for the workers, peasants and soldiers, a truly proletarian literature and art.

This question of "for whom?" is fundamental; it is a question of principle. The controversies and divergences, the opposition and disunity

arising among some comrades in the past were not on this fundamental question of principle but on secondary questions, or even on issues involving no principle. On this question of principle, however, there has been hardly any divergence between the two contending sides and they have shown almost complete agreement; to some extent, both tend to look down upon the workers, peasants and soldiers and divorce themselves from the masses. I say "to some extent" because, generally speaking, these comrades do not look down upon the workers, peasants and soldiers or divorce themselves from the masses in the same way as the Kuomintang does. Nevertheless, the tendency is there. Unless this fundamental problem is solved, many other problems will not be easy to solve. Take, for instance, the sectarianism in literary and art circles. This too is a question of principle, but sectarianism can only be eradicated by putting forward and faithfully applying the slogans, "For the workers and peasants!", "For the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies!" and "Go among the masses!" Otherwise the problem of sectarianism can never be solved. Lu Hsun once said:

A common aim is the prerequisite for a united front. ... The fact that our front is not united shows that we have not been able to unify our aims, and that some people are working only for small groups or indeed only for themselves. If we all aim at serving the masses of workers and peasants, our front will of course be united [see Note 4].

(Note 4: Lu Hsun, "My View on the League of Left-Wing Writers" in the collection Two Hearts, Complete Works, Chin. ed., Vol. IV.)

The problem existed then in Shanghai; now it exists in Chungking too. In such places the problem can hardly be solved thoroughly, because the rulers oppress the revolutionary writers and artists and deny them the freedom to go out among the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers. Here with us the situation is entirely different. We encourage revolutionary writers and artists to be active in forming intimate contacts with the workers, peasants and soldiers, giving them complete freedom to go among the masses and to create a genuinely revolutionary literature and art. Therefore, here among us the problem is nearing solution. But nearing solution is not the same as a complete and thorough solution. We must study Marxism and study society, as we have been saying, precisely in order to achieve a complete and thorough solution. By Marxism we mean living Marxism which plays an effective role in the life and struggle of the masses, not Marxism in words. With Marxism in words transformed into Marxism in real life, there will be no more sectarianism. Not only will the problem of sectarianism be solved, but many other problems as well.

II

Having settled the problem of whom to serve, we come to the next problem, how to serve. To put it in the words of some of our comrades: should we devote ourselves to raising standards, or should we devote ourselves to popularization?

In the past, some comrades, to a certain or even a serious extent, belittled and neglected popularization and laid undue stress on raising standards. Stress should be laid on raising standards, but to do so one-sidedly and exclusively, to do so excessively, is a mistake. The lack of a clear solution to the problem of "for whom?", which I referred to earlier, also manifests itself in this connection. As these comrades are not clear on the problem of "for whom?", they have no correct criteria for the "raising of standards" and the "popularization" they speak of, and are naturally still less able to find the correct relationship between the two. Since our literature and art are basically for the workers, peasants and soldiers, "popularization" means to popularize among the workers, peasants and soldiers, and "raising standards" means to advance from their present level. What should we popularize among them? Popularize what is needed and can be readily accepted by the feudal landlord class? Popularize what is needed and can be readily accepted by the bourgeoisie? Popularize what is needed and can be readily accepted by the petty-bourgeois intellectuals? No, none of these will do. We must popularize only what is needed and can be readily accepted by the workers, peasants and soldiers themselves. Consequently, prior to the task of educating the workers, peasants and soldiers, there is the task of learning from them. This is even more true of raising standards. There must be a basis from which to raise. Take a bucket of water, for instance; where is it to be raised from if not from the ground? From mid-air? From what basis, then, are literature and art to be raised? From the basis of the feudal classes? From the basis of the bourgeoisie? From the basis of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals? No, not from any of these; only from the basis of the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers. Nor does this mean raising the workers, peasants and soldiers to the "heights" of the feudal classes, the bourgeoisie or the petty-bourgeois intellectuals; it means raising the level of literature and art in the direction in which the workers, peasants and soldiers are themselves advancing, in the direction in which the proletariat is advancing. Here again the task of learning from the workers, peasants and soldiers comes in. Only by starting from the workers, peasants and soldiers can we have a correct understanding of popularization and of the raising of standards and find the proper relationship between the two.

In the last analysis, what is the source of all literature and art? Works of literature and art, as ideological forms, are products of the reflection in the human brain of the life of a given society.

Revolutionary literature and art are the products of the reflection of the life of the people in the brains of revolutionary writers and artists. The life of the people is always a mine of the raw materials for literature and art, materials in their natural form, materials that are crude, but most vital, rich and fundamental; they make all literature and art seem pallid by comparison; they provide literature and art with an inexhaustible source, their only source. They are the only source, for there can be no other. Some may ask, is there not another source in books, in the literature and art of ancient times and of foreign countries? In fact, the literary and artistic works of the past are not a source but a stream; they were created by our predecessors and the foreigners out of the literary and artistic raw materials they found in the life of the people of their time and place. We must take over all the fine things in our literary and artistic heritage, critically assimilate whatever is beneficial, and use them as examples when we create works out of the literary and artistic raw materials in the life of the people of our own time and place. It makes a difference whether or not we have such examples, the difference between crudeness and refinement, between roughness and polish, between a low and a high level, and between slower and faster work. Therefore, we must on no account reject the legacies of the ancients and the foreigners or refuse to learn from them, even though they are the works of the feudal or bourgeois classes. But taking over legacies and using them as examples must never replace our own creative work; nothing can do that. Uncritical transplantation or copying from the ancients and the foreigners is the most sterile and harmful dogmatism in literature and art. China's revolutionary writers and artists, writers and artists of promise, must go among the masses; they must for a long period of time unreservedly and whole-heartedly go among the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, go into the heat of the struggle, go to the only source, the broadest and richest source, in order to observe, experience, study and analyse all the different kinds of people, all the classes, all the masses, all the vivid patterns of life and struggle, all the raw materials of literature and art. Only then can they proceed to creative work. Otherwise, you will have nothing to work with and you will be nothing but a phoney writer or artist, the kind that Lu Hsun in his will so earnestly cautioned his son never to become [see Note 5].

(Note 5: See Lu Hsun's essay, "Death", in the "Addenda", The Last Collection of Essays Written in a Garret in the Quasi-Concession, Complete Works, Chin. ed., Vol. VI.)

Although man's social life is the only source of literature and art and is incomparably livelier and richer in content, the people are not satisfied with life alone and demand literature and art as well. Why? Because, while both are beautiful, life as reflected in works of literature and art can and ought to be on a higher plane, more intense, more concentrated, more typical, nearer the ideal, and therefore

more universal than actual everyday life. Revolutionary literature and art should create a variety of characters out of real life and help the masses to propel history forward. For example, there is suffering from hunger, cold and oppression on the one hand, and exploitation and oppression of man by man on the other. These facts exist everywhere and people look upon them as commonplace. Writers and artists concentrate such everyday phenomena, typify the contradictions and struggles within them and produce works which awaken the masses, fire them with enthusiasm and impel them to unite and struggle to transform their environment. Without such literature and art, this task could not be fulfilled, or at least not so effectively and speedily.

What is meant by popularizing and by raising standards in works of literature and art? What is the relationship between these two tasks? Popular works are simpler and plainer, and therefore more readily accepted by the broad masses of the people today. Works of a higher quality, being more polished, are more difficult to produce and in general do not circulate so easily and quickly among the masses at present. The problem facing the workers, peasants and soldiers is this: they are now engaged in a bitter and bloody struggle with the enemy but are illiterate and uneducated as a result of long years of rule by the feudal and bourgeois classes, and therefore they are eagerly demanding enlightenment, education and works of literature and art which meet their urgent needs and which are easy to absorb, in order to heighten their enthusiasm in struggle and confidence in victory, strengthen their unity and fight the enemy with one heart and one mind. For them the prime need is not "more flowers on the brocade" but "fuel in snowy weather". In present conditions, therefore, popularization is the more pressing task. It is wrong to belittle or neglect popularization.

Nevertheless, no hard and fast line can be drawn between popularization and the raising of standards. Not only is it possible to popularize some works of higher quality even now, but the cultural level of the broad masses is steadily rising. If popularization remains at the same level for ever, with the same stuff being supplied month after month and year after year, always the same "Little Cowherd" [see Note 6] and the same "man, hand, mouth, knife, cow, goat", [see Note 7] will not the educators and those being educated be six of one and half a dozen of the other? What would be the sense of such popularization? The people demand popularization and, following that, higher standards; they demand higher standards month by month and year by year. Here popularization means popularizing for the people and raising of standards means raising the level for the people. And such raising is not from mid-air, or behind closed doors, but is actually based on popularization. It is determined by and at the same time guides popularization. In China as a whole the development of the revolution and of revolutionary culture is uneven and their spread is gradual. While in one place there is popularization and then raising of standards on the basis of popularization,

in other places popularization has not even begun. Hence good experience in popularization leading to higher standards in one locality can be applied in other localities and serve to guide popularization and the raising of standards there, saving many twists and turns along the road. Internationally, the good experience of foreign countries, and especially Soviet experience, can also serve to guide us. With us, therefore, the raising of standards is based on popularization, while popularization is guided by the raising of standards. Precisely for this reason, so far from being an obstacle to the raising of standards, the work of popularization we are speaking of supplies the basis for the work of raising standards which we are now doing on a limited scale, and prepares the necessary conditions for us to raise standards in the future on a much broader scale.

(Note 6: The "Little Cowherd" is a popular Chinese folk operetta with only two people acting in it, a cowherd and a village girl, who sing a question and answer duet. In the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan, this form was used, with new words, for anti-Japanese propaganda and for a time found great favour with the public.

Note 7: The Chinese characters for these six words are written simply, with only a few strokes, and were usually included in the first lessons in old primers.)

Besides such raising of standards as meets the needs of the masses directly, there is the kind which meets their needs indirectly, that is, the kind which is needed by the cadres. The cadres are the advanced elements of the masses and generally have received more education; literature and art of a higher level are entirely necessary for them. To ignore this would be a mistake. Whatever is done for the cadres is also entirely for the masses, because it is only through the cadres that we can educate and guide the masses. If we go against this aim, if what we give the cadres cannot help them educate and guide the masses, our work of raising standards will be like shooting at random and will depart from the fundamental principle of serving the masses of the people.

To sum up: through the creative labour of revolutionary writers and artists, the raw materials found in the life of the people are shaped into the ideological form of literature and art serving the masses of the people. Included here are the more advanced literature and art as developed on the basis of elementary literature and art and as required by those sections of the masses whose level has been raised, or, more immediately, by the cadres among the masses. Also included here are elementary literature and art which, conversely, are guided by more advanced literature and art and are needed primarily by the overwhelming majority of the masses at present. Whether more advanced or elementary, all our literature and art are for the masses of the people, and in the first place for the workers, peasants and soldiers; they are created for the workers, peasants and soldiers and are for their use.

Now that we have settled the problem of the relationship between the raising of standards and popularization, that of the relationship between the specialists and the popularizers can also be settled. Our specialists are not only for the cadres, but also, and indeed chiefly, for the masses. Our specialists in literature should pay attention to the wall newspapers of the masses and to the reportage written in the army and the villages. Our specialists in drama should pay attention to the small troupes in the army and the villages. Our specialists in music should pay attention to the songs of the masses. Our specialists in the fine arts should pay attention to the fine arts of the masses. All these comrades should make close contact with comrades engaged in the work of popularizing literature and art among the masses. On the one hand, they should help and guide the popularizers, and on the other, they should learn from these comrades and through them, draw nourishment from the masses to replenish and enrich themselves so that their specialities do not become "ivory towers", detached from the masses and from reality and devoid of content or life. We should esteem the specialists, for they are very valuable to our cause. But we should tell them that no revolutionary writer or artist can do any meaningful work unless he is closely linked with the masses, gives expression to their thoughts and feelings and serves them as a loyal spokesman. Only by speaking for the masses can he educate them and only by being their pupil can he be their teacher. If he regards himself as their master, as an aristocrat who lords it over the "lower orders", then, no matter how talented he may be, he will not be needed by the masses and his work will have no future.

Is this attitude of ours utilitarian? Materialists do not oppose utilitarianism in general but the utilitarianism of the feudal, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois classes; they oppose those hypocrites who attack utilitarianism in words but in deeds embrace the most selfish and short-sighted utilitarianism. There is no "ism" in the world that transcends utilitarian considerations; in class society there can be only the utilitarianism of this or that class. We are proletarian revolutionary utilitarians and take as our point of departure the unity of the present and future interests of the broadest masses, who constitute over 90 percent of the population; hence we are revolutionary utilitarians aiming for the broadest and the most long-range objectives, not narrow utilitarians concerned only with the partial and the immediate. If, for instance, you reproach the masses for their utilitarianism and yet for your own utility, or that of a narrow clique, force on the market and propagandize among the masses a work which pleases only the few but is useless or even harmful to the majority, then you are not only insulting the masses but also revealing your own lack of self-knowledge. A thing is good only when it brings real benefit to the masses of the people. Your work may be as good as "The Spring Snow", but if for the time being it caters only to the few and the masses are still singing the "Song of the Rustic Poor", [see Note 8] you will get nowhere by simply scolding them instead of trying to raise their level. The question now is to bring

about a unity between "The Spring Snow" and the "Song of the Rustic Poor", between higher standards and popularization. Without such a unity, the highest art of any expert cannot help being utilitarian in the narrowest sense; you may call this art "pure and lofty" but that is merely your own name for it which the masses will not endorse.

(Note 8: "The Spring Snow" and the "Song of the Rustic Poor" were songs of the Kingdom of Chu in the 3rd century B.C. The music of the first was on a higher level than that of the second. As the story is told in "Sung Yu's Reply to the King of Chu" in Prince Chao Ming's Anthology of Prose and Poetry, when someone sang "The Spring Snow" in the Chu capital, only a few dozen people joined in, but when the "Song of the Rustic Poor" was sung, thousands did so.)

Once we have solved the problems of fundamental policy, of serving the workers, peasants and soldiers and of how to serve them, such other problems as whether to write about the bright or the dark side of life and the problem of unity will also be solved. If everyone agrees on the fundamental policy, it should be adhered to by all our workers, all our schools, publications and organizations in the field of literature and art and in all our literary and artistic activities. It is wrong to depart from this policy and anything at variance with it must be duly corrected.

III

Since our literature and art are for the masses of the people, we can proceed to discuss a problem of inner-Party relations, i.e., the relation between the Party's work in literature and art and the Party's work as a whole, and in addition a problem of the Party's external relations, i.e., the relation between the Party's work in literature and art and the work of non-Party people in this field, a problem of the united front in literary and art circles.

Let us consider the first problem. In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines. There is in fact no such thing as art for art's sake, art that stands above classes or art that is detached from or independent of politics. Proletarian literature and art are part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; they are, as Lenin said, cogs and wheels [see Note 9] in the whole revolutionary machine. Therefore, Party work in literature and art occupies a definite and assigned position in Party revolutionary work as a whole and is subordinated to the revolutionary tasks set by the Party in a given revolutionary period. Opposition to this arrangement is certain to lead to dualism or pluralism, and in essence amounts to "politics -- Marxist, art -- bourgeois", as with Trotsky. We do not favour overstressing the importance of literature and art, but neither do we favour under-estimating their importance.

Literature and art are subordinate to politics, but in their turn exert a great influence on politics. Revolutionary literature and art are part of the whole revolutionary cause, they are cogs and wheels in it, and though in comparison with certain other and more important parts they may be less significant and less urgent and may occupy a secondary position, nevertheless, they are indispensable cogs and wheels in the whole machine, an indispensable part of the entire revolutionary cause. If we had no literature and art even in the broadest and most ordinary sense, we could not carry on the revolutionary movement and win victory. Failure to recognize this is wrong. Furthermore, when we say that literature and art are subordinate to politics, we mean class politics, the politics of the masses, not the politics of a few so-called statesmen. Politics, whether revolutionary or counter-revolutionary, is the struggle of class against class, not the activity of a few individuals. The revolutionary struggle on the ideological and artistic fronts must be subordinate to the political struggle because only through politics can the needs of the class and the masses find expression in concentrated form. Revolutionary statesmen, the political specialists who know the science or art of revolutionary politics, are simply the leaders of millions upon millions of statesmen -- the masses. Their task is to collect the opinions of these mass statesmen, sift and refine them, and return them to the masses, who then take them and put them into practice. They are therefore not the kind of aristocratic "statesmen" who work behind closed doors and fancy they have a monopoly of wisdom. Herein lies the difference in principle between proletarian statesmen and decadent bourgeois statesmen. This is precisely why there can be complete unity between the political character of our literary and artistic works and their truthfulness. It would be wrong to fail to realize this and to debase the politics and the statesmen of the proletariat.

(Note 9: See V. I. Lenin, "Party Organization and Party Literature": "Literature must become part of the common cause of the proletariat, 'a cog and a screw' of one single great Social-Democratic mechanism set in motion by the entire politically-conscious vanguard of the entire working class." (Collected Works, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. X, p. 45.))

Let us consider next the question of the united front in the world of literature and art. Since literature and art are subordinate to politics and since the fundamental problem in China's politics today is resistance to Japan, our Party writers and artists must in the first place unite on this issue of resistance to Japan with all non-Party writers and artists (ranging from Party sympathizers and petty-bourgeois writers and artists to all those writers and artists of the bourgeois and landlord classes who are in favour of resistance to Japan). Secondly, we should unite with them on the issue of democracy. On this issue there is a section of anti-Japanese writers and artists who do not agree with us, so

the range of unity will unavoidably be somewhat more limited. Thirdly, we should unite with them on issues peculiar to the literary and artistic world, questions of method and style in literature and art; here again, as we are for socialist realism and some people do not agree, the range of unity will be narrower still. While on one issue there is unity, on another there is struggle, there is criticism. The issues are at once separate and interrelated, so that even on the very ones which give rise to unity, such as resistance to Japan, there are at the same time struggle and criticism. In a united front, "all unity and no struggle" and "all struggle and no unity" are both wrong policies -- as with the Right capitulationism and tailism, or the "Left" exclusivism and sectarianism, practised by some comrades in the past. This is as true in literature and art as in politics.

The petty-bourgeois writers and artists constitute an important force among the forces of the united front in literary and art circles in China. There are many shortcomings in both their thinking and their works, but, comparatively speaking, they are inclined towards the revolution and are close to the working people. Therefore, it is an especially important task to help them overcome their shortcomings and to win them over to the front which serves the working people.

IV

Literary and art criticism is one of the principal methods of struggle in the world of literature and art. It should be developed and, as comrades have rightly pointed out, our past work in this respect has been quite inadequate. Literary and art criticism is a complex question which requires a great deal of special study. Here I shall concentrate only on the basic problem of criteria in criticism. I shall also comment briefly on a few specific problems raised by some comrades and on certain incorrect views.

In literary and art criticism there are two criteria, the political and the artistic. According to the political criterion, everything is good that is helpful to unity and resistance to Japan, that encourages the masses to be of one heart and one mind, that opposes retrogression and promotes progress; on the other hand, everything is bad that is detrimental to unity and resistance to Japan, foments dissension and discord among the masses and opposes progress and drags people back. How can we tell the good from the bad -- by the motive (the subjective intention) or by the effect (social practice)? Idealists stress motive and ignore effect, while mechanical materialists stress effect and ignore motive. In contradistinction to both, we dialectical materialists insist on the unity of motive and effect. The motive of serving the masses is inseparably linked with the effect of winning their approval; the two must be united. The motive of serving the individual or a small clique is not good, nor is it good to have the motive of serving the masses without the

effect of winning their approval and benefiting them. In examining the subjective intention of a writer or artist, that is, whether his motive is correct and good, we do not judge by his declarations but by the effect of his actions (mainly his works) on the masses in society. The criterion for judging subjective intention or motive is social practice and its effect. We want no sectarianism in our literary and art criticism and, subject to the general principle of unity for resistance to Japan, we should tolerate literary and art works with a variety of political attitudes. But at the same time, in our criticism we must adhere firmly to principle and severely criticize and repudiate all works of literature and art expressing views in opposition to the nation, to science, to the masses and to the Communist Party, because these so-called works of literature and art proceed from the motive and produce the effect of undermining unity for resistance to Japan. According to the artistic criterion, all works of a higher artistic quality are good or comparatively good, while those of a lower artistic quality are bad or comparatively bad. Here, too, of course, social effect must be taken into account. There is hardly a writer or artist who does not consider his own work beautiful, and our criticism ought to permit the free competition of all varieties of works of art; but it is also entirely necessary to subject these works to correct criticism according to the criteria of the science of aesthetics, so that art of a lower level can be gradually raised to a higher and art which does not meet the demands of the struggle of the broad masses can be transformed into art that does.

There is the political criterion and there is the artistic criterion; what is the relationship between the two? Politics cannot be equated with art, nor can a general world outlook be equated with a method of artistic creation and criticism. We deny not only that there is an abstract and absolutely unchangeable political criterion, but also that there is an abstract and absolutely unchangeable artistic criterion; each class in every class society has its own political and artistic criteria. But all classes in all class societies invariably put the political criterion first and the artistic criterion second. The bourgeoisie always shuts out proletarian literature and art, however great their artistic merit. The proletariat must similarly distinguish among the literary and art works of past ages and determine its attitude towards them only after examining their attitude to the people and whether or not they had any progressive significance historically. Some works which politically are downright reactionary may have a certain artistic quality. The more reactionary their content and the higher their artistic quality, the more poisonous they are to the people, and the more necessary it is to reject them. A common characteristic of the literature and art of all exploiting classes in their period of decline is the contradiction between their reactionary political content and their artistic form. What we demand is the unity of politics and art, the unity of content and form, the unity of revolutionary political content and the highest possible

perfection of artistic form. Works of art which lack artistic quality have no force, however progressive they are politically. Therefore, we oppose both the tendency to produce works of art with a wrong political viewpoint and the tendency towards the "poster and slogan style" which is correct in political viewpoint but lacking in artistic power. On questions of literature and art we must carry on a struggle on two fronts.

Both these tendencies can be found in the thinking of many comrades. A good number of comrades tend to neglect artistic technique; it is therefore necessary to give attention to the raising of artistic standards. But as I see it, the political side is more of a problem at present. Some comrades lack elementary political knowledge and consequently have all sorts of muddled ideas. Let me cite a few examples from Yen-an.

"The theory of human nature." Is there such a thing as human nature? Of course there is. But there is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In class society there is only human nature of a class character; there is no human nature above classes. We uphold the human nature of the proletariat and of the masses of the people, while the landlord and bourgeois classes uphold the human nature of their own classes, only they do not say so but make it out to be the only human nature in existence. The human nature boosted by certain petty-bourgeois intellectuals is also divorced from or opposed to the masses; what they call human nature is in essence nothing but bourgeois individualism, and so, in their eyes, proletarian human nature is contrary to human nature. "The theory of human nature" which some people in Yen-an advocate as the basis of their so-called theory of literature and art puts the matter in just this way and is wholly wrong.

"The fundamental point of departure for literature and art is love, love of humanity." Now love may serve as a point of departure, but there is a more basic one. Love as an idea is a product of objective practice. Fundamentally, we do not start from ideas but from objective practice. Our writers and artists who come from the ranks of the intellectuals love the proletariat because society has made them feel that they and the proletariat share a common fate. We hate Japanese imperialism because Japanese imperialism oppresses us. There is absolutely no such thing in the world as love or hatred without reason or cause. As for the so-called love of humanity, there has been no such all-inclusive love since humanity was divided into classes. All the ruling classes of the past were fond of advocating it, and so were many so-called sages and wise men, but nobody has ever really practised it, because it is impossible in class society. There will be genuine love of humanity -- after classes are eliminated all over the world. Classes have split society into many antagonistic groupings; there will be love of all humanity when classes are eliminated, but not now. We cannot love enemies, we cannot love social evils, our aim is to destroy them. This is common sense; can it be that some of our writers and artists still do not understand this?

"Literary and artistic works have always laid equal stress on the bright and the dark, half and half." This statement contains many muddled ideas. It is not true that literature and art have always done this. Many petty-bourgeois writers have never discovered the bright side. Their works only expose the dark and are known as the "literature of exposure". Some of their works simply specialize in preaching pessimism and world-weariness. On the other hand, Soviet literature in the period of socialist construction portrays mainly the bright. It, too, describes shortcomings in work and portrays negative characters, but this only serves as a contrast to bring out the brightness of the whole picture and is not on a so-called half-and-half basis. The writers and artists of the bourgeoisie in its period of reaction depict the revolutionary masses as mobs and themselves as saints, thus reversing the bright and the dark. Only truly revolutionary writers and artists can correctly solve the problem of whether to extol or to expose. All the dark forces harming the masses of the people must be exposed and all the revolutionary struggles of the masses of the people must be extolled; this is the fundamental task of revolutionary writers and artists.

"The task of literature and art has always been to expose." This assertion, like the previous one, arises from ignorance of the science of history. Literature and art, as we have shown, have never been devoted solely to exposure. For revolutionary writers and artists the targets for exposure can never be the masses, but only the aggressors, exploiters and oppressors and the evil influence they have on the people. The masses too have shortcomings, which should be overcome by criticism and self-criticism which the people's own ranks, and such criticism and self-criticism is also one of the most important tasks of literature and art. But this should not be regarded as any sort of "exposure of the people". As for the people, the question is basically one of education and of raising their level. Only counter-revolutionary writers and artists describe the people as "born fools" and the revolutionary masses as "tyrannical mobs".

"This is still the period of the satirical essay, and Lu Hsun's style of writing is still needed." Living under the rule of the dark forces and deprived of freedom of speech, Lu Hsun used burning satire and freezing irony, cast in the form of essays, to do battle; and he was entirely right. We, too, must hold up to sharp ridicule the fascists, the Chinese reactionaries and everything that harms the people; but in the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region and the anti-Japanese base areas behind the enemy lines, where democracy and freedom are granted in full to the revolutionary writers and artists and withheld only from the counter-revolutionaries, the style of the essay should not simply be like Lu Hsun's. Here we can shout at the top of our voices and have no need for veiled and roundabout expressions, which are hard for the people to understand. When dealing with the people and not with their enemies, Lu Hsun never ridiculed or attacked the revolutionary people and the revolutionary Party in his "satirical essay period", and these

essays were entirely different in manner from those directed against the enemy. To criticize the people's shortcomings is necessary, as we have already said, but in doing so we must truly take the stand of the people and speak out of whole-hearted eagerness to protect and educate them. To treat comrades like enemies is to go over to the stand of the enemy. Are we then to abolish satire? No. Satire is always necessary. But there are several kinds of satire, each with a different attitude, satire to deal with our enemies, satire to deal with our allies and satire to deal with our own ranks. We are not opposed to satire in general; what we must abolish is the abuse of satire.

"I am not given to praise and eulogy. The works of people who eulogize what is bright are not necessarily great and the works of those who depict the dark are not necessarily paltry." If you are a bourgeois writer or artist, you will eulogize not the proletariat but the bourgeoisie, and if you are a proletarian writer or artist, you will eulogize not the bourgeoisie but the proletariat and working people: it must be one or the other. The works of the eulogists of the bourgeoisie are not necessarily great, nor are the works of those who show that the bourgeoisie is dark necessarily paltry; the works of the eulogists of the proletariat are not necessarily not great, but the works of those who depict the so-called "darkness" of the proletariat are bound to be paltry -- are these not facts of history as regards literature and art? Why should we not eulogize the people, the creators of the history of mankind? Why should we not eulogize the proletariat, the Communist Party, New Democracy and socialism? There is a type of person who has no enthusiasm for the people's cause and looks coldly from the sidelines at the struggles and victories of the proletariat and its vanguard; what he is interested in, and will never weary of eulogizing, is himself, plus perhaps a few figures in his small coterie. Of course, such petty-bourgeois individualists are unwilling to eulogize the deeds and virtues of the revolutionary people or heighten their courage in struggle and their confidence in victory. Persons of this type are merely termites in the revolutionary ranks; of course, the revolutionary people have no need for these "singers".

"It is not a question of stand; my class stand is correct, my intentions are good and I understand all right, but I am not good at expressing myself and so the effect turns out bad." I have already spoken about the dialectical materialist view of motive and effect. Now I want to ask, is not the question of effect one of stand? A person who acts solely by motive and does not inquire what effect his action will have is like a doctor who merely writes prescriptions but does not care how many patients die of them. Or take a political party which merely makes declarations but does not care whether they are carried out. It may well be asked, is this a correct stand? And is the intention here good? Of course, mistakes may occur even though the effect has been taken into account beforehand, but is the intention good when one continues in

the same old rut after facts have proved that the effect is bad? In judging a party or a doctor, we must look at practice, at the effect. The same applies in judging a writer. A person with truly good intentions must take the effect into account, sum up experience and study the methods or, in creative work, study the technique of expression. A person with truly good intentions must criticize the shortcomings and mistakes in his own work with the utmost candour and resolve to correct them. This is precisely why Communists employ the method of self-criticism. This alone is the correct stand. Only in this process of serious and responsible practice is it possible gradually to understand what the correct stand is and gradually obtain a good grasp of it. If one does not move in this direction in practice, if there is simply the complacent assertion that one "understands all right", then in fact one has not understood at all.

"To call on us to study Marxism is to repeat the mistake of the dialectical materialist creative method, which will harm the creative mood." To study Marxism means to apply the dialectical materialist and historical materialist viewpoint in our observation of the world, of society and of literature and art; it does not mean writing philosophical lectures into our works of literature and art. Marxism embraces but cannot replace realism in literary and artistic creation, just as it embraces but cannot replace the atomic and electronic theories in physics. Emptiness, dry dogmatic formulas do indeed destroy the creative mood; not only that, they first destroy Marxism. Dogmatic "Marxism" is not Marxism, it is anti-Marxism. Then does not Marxism destroy the creative mood? Yes, it does. It definitely destroys creative moods that are feudal, bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, liberalistic, individualist, nihilist, art-for-art's sake, aristocratic, decadent or pessimistic, and every other creative mood that is alien to the masses of the people and to the proletariat. So far as proletarian writers and artists are concerned, should not these kinds of creative moods be destroyed? I think they should; they should be utterly destroyed. And while they are being destroyed, something new can be constructed.

V

The problems discussed here exist in our literary and art circles in Yenan. What does that show? It shows that wrong styles of work still exist to a serious extent in our literary and art circles and that there are still many defects among our comrades, such as idealism, dogmatism, empty illusions, empty talk, contempt for practice and aloofness from the masses, all of which call for an effective and serious campaign of rectification.

We have many comrades who are still not very clear on the difference between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. There are many Party members who have joined the Communist Party organizationally

but have not yet joined the Party wholly or at all ideologically. Those who have not joined the Party ideologically still carry a great deal of the muck of the exploiting classes in their heads, and have no idea at all of what proletarian ideology, or communism, or the Party is. "Proletarian ideology?" they think. "The same old stuff!" Little do they know that it is no easy matter to acquire this stuff. Some will never have the slightest Communist flavour about them as long as they live and can only end up by leaving the Party. Therefore, though the majority in our Party and in our ranks are clean and honest, we must in all seriousness put things in order both ideologically and organizationally if we are to develop the revolutionary movement more effectively and bring it to speedier success. To put things in order organizationally requires our first doing so ideologically, our launching a struggle of proletarian ideology against non-proletarian ideology. An ideological struggle is already under way in literary and art circles in Yenan, and it is most necessary. Intellectuals of petty-bourgeois origin always stubbornly try in all sorts of ways, including literary and artistic ways, to project themselves and spread their views, and they want the Party and the world to be remoulded in their own image. In the circumstances it is our duty to jolt these "comrades" and tell them sharply, "That won't work! The proletariat cannot accommodate itself to you; to yield to you would actually be to yield to the big landlord class and the big bourgeoisie and to run the risk of undermining our Party and our country." Whom then must we yield to? We can mould the Party and the world only in the image of the proletarian vanguard. We hope our comrades in literary and art circles will realize the seriousness of this great debate and join actively in this struggle, so that every comrade may become sound and our entire ranks may become truly united and consolidated ideologically and organizationally.

Because of confusion in their thinking, many of our comrades are not quite able to draw a real distinction between our revolutionary base areas and the Kuomintang areas and they make many mistakes as a consequence. A good number of comrades have come here from the garrets of Shanghai, and in coming from those garrets to the revolutionary base areas, they have passed not only from one kind of place to another but from one historical epoch to another. One society is semi-feudal, semi-colonial, under the rule of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie, the other is a revolutionary new-democratic society under the leadership of the proletariat. To come to the revolutionary bases means to enter an epoch unprecedented in the thousands of years of Chinese history, an epoch in which the masses of the people wield state power. Here the people around us and the audience for our propaganda are totally different. The past epoch is gone, never to return. Therefore, we must integrate ourselves with the new masses without any hesitation. If, living among the new masses, some comrades, as I said before, are still "lacking in knowledge and understanding" and remain "heroes with no place to display their prowess", then difficulties will arise for them,

and not only when they go out to the villages; right here in Yen-an difficulties will arise for them. Some comrades may think, "Well, I had better continue writing for the readers in the Great Rear Area; [see Note 10] it is a job I know well and has 'national significance'." This idea is entirely wrong. The Great Rear Area is also changing. Readers there expect authors in the revolutionary base areas to tell about the new people and the new world and not to bore them with the same old tales. Therefore, the more a work is written for the masses in the revolutionary base areas, the more national significance will it have. Fadeyev in The Debacle [see Note 11] only told the story of a small guerrilla unit and had no intention of pandering to the palate of readers in the old world; yet the book has exerted world-wide influence. At any rate in China its influence is very great, as you know. China is moving forward, not back, and it is the revolutionary base areas, not any of the backward, retrogressive areas, that are leading China forward. This is a fundamental issue that, above all, comrades must come to understand in the rectification movement.

(Note 10: The Great Rear Area was the name given during the War of Resistance to the vast areas under Kuomintang control in southwestern and northwestern China which were not occupied by the Japanese invaders, as distinguished from the "small rear area", the anti-Japanese base areas behind the enemy lines under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Note 11: The Debacle by the famous Soviet writer Alexander Fadeyev was published in 1927 and translated into Chinese by Lu Hsun. The novel describes the struggle of a partisan detachment of workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals in Siberia against the counter-revolutionary brigands during the Soviet civil war.)

Since integration into the new epoch of the masses is essential, it is necessary thoroughly to solve the problem of the relationship between the individual and the masses. This couplet from a poem by Lu Hsun should be our motto:

Fierce-browed, I coolly defy a thousand pointing fingers,
Head-bowed, like a willing ox I serve the children. [see Note 12]

The "thousand pointing fingers" are our enemies, and we will never yield to them, no matter how ferocious. The "children" here symbolize the proletariat and the masses. All Communists, all revolutionaries, all revolutionary literary and art workers should learn from the example of Lu Hsun and be "oxen" for the proletariat and the masses, bending their backs to the task until their dying day. Intellectuals who want to integrate themselves with the masses, who want to serve the masses, must go through a process in which they and the masses come to know each other well. This process may, and certainly will, involve much pain and friction, but if you have the determination, you will be able to fulfil these requirements.

(Note 12: This couplet is from Lu Hsun's "In Mockery of Myself" in The Collection Outside the Collection, Complete Works, Chin. ed., Vol. VII.)

Today I have discussed only some of the problems of fundamental orientation for our literature and art movement; many specific problems remain which will require further study. I am confident that comrades here are determined to move in the direction indicated. I believe that in the course of the rectification movement and in the long period of study and work to come, you will surely be able to bring about a transformation in yourselves and in your works, to create many fine works which will be warmly welcomed by the masses of the people, and to advance the literature and art movement in the revolutionary base areas and throughout China to a glorious new stage.

CSO: 3530-D

TRUST THE MASSES, RELY ON THE MASSES

[Following is a translation of an editorial in the Chinese-language periodical Hung ch'i (Red Flag), No. 9, 1 July 1966.]

A great proletarian cultural revolutionary mass movement is now rising throughout the country. In response to the call of the CCP Central Committee and Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the revolutionary masses in their tens of millions, with the force of a thunderbolt, have launched a sharp struggle against the antiparty, antisocialist representatives of the bourgeoisie. The monsters and demons have been engulfed in the great ocean of the broad masses and dealt extraordinarily heavy blows.

The fact that this great proletarian cultural revolution is being carried out by mobilizing the broad masses and employing the methods of mass movement is a tremendously creative thing.

The fundamental feature of this great proletarian cultural revolution is this -- hundreds of millions of people have risen up and are subjecting the old world to criticism.

Chairman Mao tells us: "The revolutionary war is a war of the masses; it can be waged only by mobilizing the masses and relying on them." This is a universal truth. It is true of revolutionary war, it is true of the whole proletarian cause, and, without question, it is true of the great proletarian cultural revolution. Without a mass movement, there can be no proletarian cultural revolution.

In the past, our party relied on the broad masses to wage the revolutionary wars that overthrew the rule of imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat capitalism. It was precisely the organized masses under the leadership of Chairman Mao who overthrew the old China dominated by the Kuomintang reactionaries and founded the new China under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Today, in carrying out this great proletarian cultural revolution, which touches the people to their very souls, our party must also rely on the broad masses. Whether the gun or the pen is used as the weapon with which to criticize the old world, reliance on the masses is essential.

The great proletarian cultural revolution is the revolutionary cause of the masses. Throughout its whole course it is essential to rely on the masses and boldly mobilize them. Only by a mass mobilization, an energetic mass movement, the use of big-character posters, and a full and frank airing of views and great debate will the great proletarian cultural revolution be able to develop in breadth and depth, expose and strike down all the monsters and demons, settle the question of who will win out in the ideological field, the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, and victoriously fulfill the tasks of the great proletarian cultural revolution.

History has proved that the broad revolutionary masses are the gravediggers of the reactionary state machine and the reactionary social system. And history will certainly prove the broad revolutionary masses to be the gravediggers of all exploiting class ideology.

A vast source of initiative for the cultural revolution resides in the broad masses of the people. In recent years, revolutionary cadres, revolutionary intellectuals, and especially, the broad masses of the workers, peasants, and soldiers have achieved great success in their living study and application of Chairman Mao's works. They have grasped Mao Tse-tung's thought. And they have made good use of Chairman Mao's writings in class struggle, in the struggle for production, and in scientific experiment. In the current great proletarian cultural revolution, too, they are making good use of Chairman Mao's works. They are the true wall of steel that guards the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are the main force for destroying the ideological and cultural positions in which the representatives of the bourgeoisie have entrenched themselves. To underestimate this would lead to a tremendous error.

The great proletarian cultural revolutionary movement which is now sweeping ahead magnificently has proved over the past few months:

That the broad masses who have grasped Mao Tse-tung's thought have the greatest ability to detect monsters and demons, see through them, and identify them;

That the broad masses who have grasped Mao Tse-tung's thought fight most effectively against the monsters and demons and deal them most accurate and heavy blows;

That the broad masses who have grasped Mao Tse-tung's thought are best equipped to fight and thoroughly repudiate the representatives of the bourgeoisie by citing facts and reasoning things out.

The great proletarian cultural revolutionary movement which is now sweeping ahead magnificently has proved over the past few months:

That the CCP leadership, armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, is the fundamental guarantee of success in the great proletarian cultural revolution.

Correct party leadership means to be skillful at applying the mass line and to take the unrestricted mobilization of the masses as the basis of the movement from beginning to end. Confidence in and reliance on the masses is the source of limitless strength for our party. Confidence in, reliance on, and unreserved mobilization of the masses, and the energetic development of the mass movement, constitute an extremely important policy for our party in the carrying out of the great proletarian cultural revolution.

The question of willingness to trust and rely on the masses and to dare to mobilize them freely marks the watershed between the proletarian world outlook and the bourgeois world outlook, and fundamentally differentiates a genuine Marxist-Leninist party from all the revisionist parties. Our party has strength because it trusts and relies on the masses and dares to mobilize the masses freely. The function of leadership can be exercised in the great proletarian cultural revolution only by marching at the head of the mass movement and mobilizing the masses freely. If, on the other hand, there is fear of the masses and mass movements, leadership is out of the question; besides, this goes against the principle of party leadership which Chairman Mao has often taught us.

Chairman Mao has taught us that in the great proletarian cultural revolution it is necessary to organize and expand the ranks of the proletarian left and to rely on them to mobilize the masses, unite with the masses, and educate the masses.

A resolute proletarian revolutionary left exists in every part of the country. The overwhelming majority of the members of the CCP and the Chinese Young Communist League are trustworthy and reliable. Under the correct leadership of the party, they form the nucleus of the proletarian revolutionary left.

Those of the proletarian revolutionary left follow most faithfully the teachings of the party and Chairman Mao Tse-tung. They are the bravest and the most resolute people in the revolution, they are the most capable in uniting with the great majority, and they have the ability to serve as models in the struggle. They are the vanguard in this great proletarian cultural revolution.

Our party must rely on the resolute left in all areas and all departments. It must not be restricted by erroneous stereotyped ideas about rank, past working experience, and age, but must organize the resolute left as the backbone of the movement and boldly and freely permit them to play the role of pacesetter in the great proletarian cultural revolution.

Only by relying on the resolute left and by mobilizing the masses freely will it be possible truly to implement the instructions of Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee and distinguish genuine from sham revolutionaries, and revolutionaries from counterrevolutionaries. Only in this way will it be possible to lead the great proletarian cultural revolution and insure its healthy development.

According to Chairman Mao's teachings, it is a fundamental principle of the party's method of leadership that the leadership should be united with the masses. This principle must also be adhered to in the great proletarian cultural revolution.

The mass line is the fundamental line of the party in all work. The masses are the source of strength in all of our revolutionary work. By relying on the masses, we can overcome all difficulties, triumph over all enemies, and do all our work well. Once divorced from the masses, we shall become water without a source, a plant without roots, and we shall accomplish nothing.

Chairman Mao has said: "Every comrade must be helped to understand that as long as we rely on the people, believe firmly in the inexhaustible creative power of the masses, and, hence, trust and identify ourselves with them, no enemy can crush us while we can crush every enemy and overcome every difficulty."

In the great proletarian cultural revolution, we must follow Chairman Mao's teachings, trust the masses, rely on them, freely mobilize them, and be at one with them in order to carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end.

CSO: 3530-D

THE COMPASS FOR THE GREAT PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION --
NOTE ON THE REPRINTING OF
"TALKS AT THE YENAN FORUM ON LITERATURE AND ART"

[Following is a translation of an editorial by the Hung-ch'i Editorial Board in the Chinese-language periodical Hung-ch'i (Red Flag), No. 9, 1 July 1966.]

In commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the founding of the CCP, Red Flag is reprinting Comrade Mao Tse-tung's "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" with a view to stepping up the development of China's great proletarian cultural revolution.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" was first published 24 years ago. With genius, Comrade Mao Tse-tung in this article creatively developed the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and the Marxist-Leninist theory on literature and art. This is an important, epochmaking document. It scientifically sums up not only the basic experience of the movement for revolutionary literature and art in China since the "4 May Movement," but also the basic experience of the movement for revolutionary literature and art of the international proletariat. It most completely, most comprehensively, and most systematically sums up the struggle between the two lines on the cultural front. It offers, for the first time in the history of the proletarian revolution, the most complete, most thoroughgoing, and most correct Marxist-Leninist line on literature and art.

Thus sum of practice in struggle over the past 24 years has proved that the question of whether one supports or opposes Comrade Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art establishes the line of demarcation between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and between revolution and counterrevolution.

These talks of Comrade Mao Tse-tung made a systematic criticism of the bourgeois line on literature and art of the 1930's represented by Comrade Chou Yang. Politically, the bourgeois line on literature and art of the 1930's represented by Chou Yang was the product of Wang Ming's right capitulationism and "left" opportunism; ideologically, it was the manifestation of the bourgeois and petit bourgeois world outlook; and organizationally, it was sectarianism, working for the interests of the individual or of a small group.

For 24 years, Chou Yang and company have consistently refused to carry out Comrade Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art and stubbornly adhered to the bourgeois, revisionist black line of literature and art.

Since liberation, Chou Yang and company, bourgeois representatives within the party, who usurped the leadership of literary and art circles, have stubbornly insisted on carrying through their bourgeois line on literature and art which is against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought. Under the control and influence of this black line came a spate of erroneous theories and profusion of poisonous weeds, creating a miasma in the literary and art circles. They turned literature and art into tools to attack the dictatorship of the proletariat and into means to restore capitalism.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out in December 1963 that in all forms of art -- drama, ballads, music, the fine arts, the dance, the cinema, poetry and literature, and so forth -- problems abounded; the people engaged in them were numerous; and in many departments very little had been achieved so far in socialist transformation. The "dead" still dominated in many fields. Was it not absurd that many communists showed enthusiasm in advancing feudal and capitalist art, but no zeal in promoting socialist art? Comrade Mao Tse-tung added.

In June 1964, Comrade Mao Tse-tung declared that in the past 15 years, the literary and art circles had for the most part failed (this does not apply to every individual) to carry out the policies of the party and had acted as high and mighty bureaucrats, had failed to go to the workers, peasants, and soldiers, and had failed to reflect the socialist revolution and construction. In recent years they had even verged on revisionism. If they did not take serious steps to remold themselves, sooner or later they were bound to become groups like the Hungarian Petofi Club.

These statements of Comrade Mao Tse-tung were directed precisely at Chou Yang and company.

In the course of the past few months, the great proletarian cultural revolution, launched and led by the party's Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, has lifted the lid covering the dominance of the black line in literary and art circles during the 16 years since the founding of the CPR, has brought out into the open and exposed to the light of day one group of monsters and demons after another, and has conducted a vast and powerful campaign of criticism and struggle against them. This great proletarian cultural revolution is a struggle in defense of Mao Tse-tung's thought concerning cardinal issues of right and wrong; it is an extremely intense, extremely sharp, and extremely profound class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It is an issue of prime importance which affects the destiny and future of our party and country.

It is most important at this moment to make a new study of these talks of Comrade Mao Tse-tung. This is of immense practical and far-reaching significance.

The "talks" are a compass which gives us guidance in acute and complicated class struggle, in finding our direction, and in distinguishing between fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds, between revolution and counterrevolution, and between true revolution and sham revolution.

The "talks" are a "monster-detector," the sharpest weapon for throughout destroying all monsters and demons. Facing it, all words and deeds which oppose the party, oppose socialism, and oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought will be showed up in their true forms and will have no place to hide.

The "talks" are the clarion that sounds the advance. They call on the broad masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers to act as the main force, and on the workers in the field of literature and art to go among the workers, peasants, and soldiers, to go into the heat of the struggle, to take an active part in this great proletarian cultural revolution, to repudiate thoroughly the reactionary culture of feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism, and to create an entirely new, proletarian socialist culture.

In this great proletarian cultural revolution, which touches the people to their very souls, when we master this sharpest of weapons, we shall be able to defeat all of the old ideology and culture and all of the old customs and habits, and we shall be able to establish a thoroughly revolutionary proletarian world outlook.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has advanced Marxism-Leninism to an entirely new stage under the new conditions of the domestic and international class struggle, under the new conditions of the struggles being waged in the present era by the proletariat, the oppressed people in all countries, and the oppressed nations against imperialism and modern revisionism. Mao Tse-tung's thought is the summit of Marxism-Leninism in the present era. Comrade Mao Tse-tung's "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art," "On New Democracy," "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," and "Speech at the CCP National Conference on Propaganda Work" -- these four brilliant works are programmatic documents for the great proletarian cultural revolution.

Here we are reprinting this great work, "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art," so that it may be studied by a broad readership.

CSO: 3530-D

THOROUGHLY CRITICIZE AND REPUDIATE THE REVISIONIST LINE
OF SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL LEADING MEMBERS OF THE FORMER
PEKING MUNICIPAL PARTY COMMITTEE

[Following is a translation of an editorial in the
Chinese-language periodical Hung-Ch'i (Red Flag), No. 9,
1 July 1966.]

The great proletarian cultural revolution is advancing with great rapidity and intensity. One group of monsters and demons after another has been exposed, and one reactionary bastion after another has been shattered. The broad masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers and of party cadres and revolutionary intellectuals in Peking, with the direct support of Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the CCP Central Committee, have exposed and overthrown the former Peking municipal party committee, the insidious antiparty and antisocialist clique. The counterrevolutionary, revisionist true colors of some of the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee have been fully brought out into the open.

This is an excellent, important event in the history of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and a new victory for Mao Tse-tung's thought.

A black line opposed to the party, to socialism, and to Mao Tse-tung's thought ran through the leadership exercised by some of the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee. The main point of this black line was opposition to the proletarian revolution, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to the correct line of the CCP Central Committee and Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and application of a counterrevolutionary, revisionist line. This was manifested in the following respects:

First, resistance to the great proletarian cultural revolution: Some of the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee feared the great proletarian cultural revolution greatly, and they stubbornly opposed and sabotaged the great cultural revolution. Their counterrevolutionary, revisionist line was exposed precisely in the course of the current great cultural revolution.

Under the direct leadership of Chairman Mao and the party's Central Committee, the Shanghai Municipal CCP Committee started the criticism of Wu Han's "Hai Jui's Dismissal," and sounded the clarion call for the great proletarian cultural revolution. The Shanghai Wen Hui Pao printed Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's article "On the New Historical Drama 'Hai Jui's Dismissal'" and this angered the gang of revisionist overlords in the former Peking municipal party committee.

They made unscrupulous attacks on the Shanghai municipal party committee, and flagrantly acted against Comrade Mao Tse-tung's instructions. To them, Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's article seemed as dangerous as floods and wild beasts, and they used the propaganda organs in their hands to try in every way possible to resist and block the article. They resorted to all sorts of vile and vicious tricks to suppress and deal blows at all proletarian revolutionaries who persist in Comrade Mao Tse-tung's correct line, and to shield the sinister antiparty and anti-socialist counterrevolutionary gangsters.

Even after Comrade Mao Tse-tung criticized the former Peking municipal party committee, they continued to carry out organized and systematic resistance in an attempt "to save the queen by sacrificing the knights." The editorial note of Chienhsien (Frontline) and Peking Daily on 16 April was a concentrated expression of the counter-revolutionary double-dealing tricks they played. Further, they carried out a series of clandestine, underground, and illegal activities, clung desperately to their positions, and collected information about proletarian revolutionaries in preparation for a counteroffensive.

This series of antiparty activities prepared the conditions for their own complete collapse. Thus, the counterrevolutionary features of the gang of representatives of the bourgeoisie who had long hidden themselves in the party were brought to light.

Second, opposition to the socialist education movement in the urban and rural areas: The opposition of the former Peking municipal party committee to the great proletarian cultural revolution was the continuation and development of its consistent opposition over the past few years to the socialist education movement in the urban and rural areas and to the socialist revolution.

It opposed and resisted the policy of the urban and rural socialist education movement formulated by Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee, it opposed the full mobilization of the masses to lift the lid on the class struggle, it protected the party members who were in power at the basic level in the urban and rural areas and were taking the road of capitalism, and it protected the landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, bad elements, and rightists. As the urban and rural socialist education movement developed more profoundly, it lost no time in "applying the brake," and worked vigorously to reverse decisions on closed cases; it backed up the landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, bad elements, and rightists; it attacked the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants, and revolutionary activists and carried out organized and systematic counterattacks in revenge.

This line of the former Peking municipal party committee was precisely a line of opposing socialist revolution and of restoring capitalism.

Third, abandonment of the concepts of classes and class struggle in an attempt to bring about a "peaceful evolution": The former Peking municipal party committee stubbornly opposed and resisted Comrade Mao Tse-tung's guiding principles regarding classes and class struggle in socialist society. It was opposed to taking class struggle as the key link in all fields of work, in culture, education, industry, agriculture, finance, trade, and so forth. It was opposed to placing proletarian politics in the forefront and, instead, it placed bourgeois politics in the forefront.

Because it abandoned the concepts of classes and class struggle of Marxism-Leninism, of Mao Tse-tung's thought, it could not but sink into the quagmire of Khrushchev revisionism.

What it carried out was, in reality, such revisionist rubbish as Khrushchev's "party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people." Its bourgeois nature was crystal clear.

On various fronts, it ruthlessly suppressed and dealt blows at the proletarian revolutionary left and revolutionary masses, and did all it could to let loose all the monsters and demons. This small handful of counterrevolutionary revisionists carried out "peaceful evolution" in some units and departments of the Peking municipal party and government organizations, and, as a result, the leadership of these groups was usurped by representatives of the bourgeoisie.

Fourth, transformation of the dictatorship of proletariat into a bourgeois dictatorship: The small handful of counterrevolutionary

revisionists in the former Peking municipal party committee waved the flag of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but, in reality, it did its utmost to carry out bourgeois dictatorial rule. Arrogantly, arbitrarily, and without any sense of democracy, it attacked and suppressed the broad masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers and of party cadres and revolutionary intellectuals. Its "democracy" was the democracy of a handful of bourgeois representatives who opposed the party, opposed socialism, and opposed Mao Tse-tung's thought; the democracy of a handful of bourgeois reactionary "academic authorities"; and the democracy of a handful of landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, and rightists. It was a group of despots, a bunch of friends.

Fifth, preparation of public opinion for the restoration of capitalism and subversion of proletarian political power: The small handful of counterrevolutionary revisionists of the former Peking municipal party committee laid special stress on preparing public opinion for the restoration of capitalism and the subversion of proletarian political power. It used Chienhsien, Peking Daily, and Peking Evening News as its tools to oppose the party, socialism, and Mao Tse-tung's thought and to spread revisionist poison. Making use of the newspapers, journals, radio broadcasts, books, lectures, literary works, films, theaters, and so forth that it was able to control, it poured out a great deal of poison to corrupt and injure the people of the whole country. All this was done with a view to preparing conditions for the restoration of capitalism.

Sixth, opposition to the educational policy put forward by Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee, and application of a bourgeois and revisionist educational policy: Some school under the control of some of the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee, instead of serving proletarian politics, worked in the interests of a bourgeois restoration. Instead of cultivating successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause, they were grooming new bourgeois intellectuals. While giving every attention to bourgeois elements, they discriminated against and persecuted the broad masses of revolutionary teachers and students. Peking University, under their control, was a typical stubborn stronghold of reaction.

Seventh, opposition to the living study and application of Chairman Mao's works: The handful of former Peking municipal party committee members did their utmost to oppose the living study and application of Chairman Mao's works by the broad masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers, and cadres. Harboring intense hatred for Mao Tse-tung's thought, it reacted against any mention of it and swore and flew into a rage.

It attacked and suppressed the masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers and revolutionary cadres who listened to Chairman Mao's words and acted in accordance with his instructions. This handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists indulged in evil-doing. What it dreaded most was to be shown up in its true colors under the sunlight of Mao Tse-tung's thought. Above all it dreaded mastery by the masses of the infinitely powerful weapon of Mao Tse-tung's thought to overthrow its reactionary rule.

Eighth, the enlistment of capitulationists and turncoats and the formation of factions for their own private purposes: To push through their revisionist political line, these principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee pursued a "feudal guide" organizational line of forming factions for their own private purposes. Using such base means as handing out official posts, making promises, and enlisting capitulationists and turncoats, they bought over and gained the allegiance of a group of people as a band of loyal confederates who acted as their faithful lackeys.

Ninth, the creation of a tight barricade against the party Central Committee: The handful of antiparty elements in the former Peking municipal party committee regarded the Peking municipality as an "independent duchy," watertight and impenetrable, and nobody was allowed to intervene or criticize it -- it was like the proverbial tiger who no one dare touch. On the other hand, it itself reached out everywhere with its grasping hands. It was a gang of conspirators and careerists.

Tenth, the waving of "red flags" to oppose the red flag: The main reason these antiparty, antisocialist, revisionist elements were able to conceal themselves for quite some time was that they waved "red flags" to oppose the red flag, carried the signboard of Marxism-Leninism to oppose Marxism-Leninism, carried the signboard of Mao Tse-tung's thought to oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought, carried the signboard of the dictatorship of the proletariat to oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat, and carried the communist signboard to engage in anticommunist intrigues. These maneuvers by the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee very closely resembled those of Khrushchev. They are persons of the Khrushchev type.

Step by step the Central Committee of the party perceived the revisionist line of the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee. But the full exposure of their revisionist nature required a certain course of time and certain "soil and weather" conditions. Even a poisonous snake comes out of its hold under certain weather conditions. The moment these poisonous snakes came out of their holes, they were captured by Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee

and immediately set upon by the broad masses of party cadres and people.

The exposure of this sinister gang of some of the principal members of the former Peking municipal party committee, which was against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought, is an excellent thing, a normal event in party life. Comrade Mao Tse-tung told us long ago that if there were no contradictions and no struggles in the party, the party's life would come to an end. Under certain conditions, the contradictions within the party can change from nonantagonistic to antagonistic. The fact that our party was able in good time to detect and destroy the reactionary bastion of the former Peking municipal party committee, which was controlled by a handful of revisionists, is a fine demonstration of the power and strength of our party and the exceptional wisdom and greatness of the leadership given by Chairman Mao and the party Central Committee.

Some of the principal leading members of the former Peking municipal party committee are very good teachers by negative example. What we learn from all this is that in order to step up the great proletarian cultural revolution and to wrest back the leadership usurped by the bourgeois in the field of culture, we must first of all expose, criticize, and struggle against the representatives of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the party, government, army, and various circles in the field of culture. The struggle against these revisionists, who are against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought, is a struggle between restoration and opposition to restoration, and a struggle to prevent the dictatorship of the proletariat from changing into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In the great proletarian cultural revolution, the buoyant masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers and of the party cadres and revolutionary intellectuals in Peking are arming themselves with Mao Tse-tung's thought, and using it as the weapon for combat and criticism. Under the leadership of the new Peking municipal party committee, they are sweeping away all monsters and demons with the tremendous force of a thunderbolt.

For a long time, the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, of the Communist Party and Young Communist League members, and of the revolutionary intellectuals in Peking resisted and fought against the black antiparty, antisocialist line of the former Peking municipal party committee. They cherish boundless love for Chairman Mao and support the party Central Committee without reservation. Heeding the instructions of the party Central Committee and Chairman Mao, they have done a great deal of work and made their own contribution to the cause of socialist revolution and socialist construction. Upward of 95 percent

of the people and more than 95 percent of the cadres in Peking will certainly unite on the basis of Mao Tse-tung's thought, take what Chairman Mao says as their supreme instruction for all kinds of work, and, under the leadership of the new Peking municipal party committee, thoroughly eradicate the influence of the counterrevolutionary revisionist line of the former Peking municipal party committee and score new victories on all fronts.

CSO: 3530-D



CHOU YANG'S BLACK ARROW TO TURN HISTORY UPSIDE DOWN --
COMMENT ON A NOTE IN THE COMPLETE WORKS OF LU HSUN, VOL. VI

[Following is a translation of an article by Juan Ming and Juan Jo-ying in the Chinese-language periodical Hung-Ch'i (Red Flag), No. 9, 1 July 1966.]

On page 614 of the Complete Works of Lu Hsun, Vol. VI, there is a note on Lu Hsun's article "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan." This note was made by Comrade Chou Yang and other people such as Lin Mo-han and Shao Chuanlin. It openly stood in opposition to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's historical summing up of the movement for literature and art of the "thirties," attacked Lu Hsun, the great standard bearer of the left literary and art movement, tried to foist a bourgeois, revisionist black line on literature and art as a Marxist-Leninist line, and tried to present the bourgeois capitulationist slogan of "A literature of national defense" as a proletarian slogan. Their aim was openly to raise the sinister flag of the literature and art of the "thirties" in opposition to the party's and Comrade Mao's line on literature and art.

In order to understand the whole thing we wish to make public how this note was made.

At the enlarged meeting of the Chinese Writers Association organized by the party from July to September 1957, Chou Yang, the ringleader of the black line on literature and art, tried to turn upside down the history of the struggle on the literary and art front between the roads and to spread a group of poisonous weeds. Chou Yang and others unscrupulously attacked Lu Hsun's proletarian slogan of writing "literature for the public on the national revolutionary war," and attacked his articles such as "In reply to the Trotskiyites," "On our literary movement," and "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan."

But with the cowardice of thieves, they dared not openly direct the spearhead at Lu Hsun. They clamored that the slogan of wiring "literature for the public on the national revolutionary war" and was put forward jointly by Feng Hsueh-feng and Hu Feng, and that those articles actually written by Feng Hsueh-feng were made public when Lu Hsun was unable to talk due to his serious illness. At a glance the spearhead was seemingly directed at rightist Feng Hsueh-feng and counterrevolutionary element Hu Feng. But actually it viciously attacked Lu Hsun, opposed the proletarian revolutionary line on literature and art represented by Lu Hsun, and promoted the black line of the bourgeois literature and art of the "thirties" represented by Chou Yang.

After the meeting concluded, Chou Yang, Lin Mo-han, Shao Chuan-lin, and others were busy writing letters to and visiting each other, and making the note for the article "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan" according to what they had agreed on at the meeting of the Chinese Writers Association.

Instigated and directed by the Soviet splittists, a fake meeting under the cloak of an "emergency meeting of the Afro-Asian Writers' Bureau" was held in Cairo from 19 to 20 June 1966. This is a grave crime committed by the Soviet splittists to cause an open split in the Afro-Asian peoples' movement, the consequences of which are entirely their responsibility. They have taken the illegal and despicable step of creating a fake Afro-Asian Writers' Bureau and what they call to remove our respected secretary general from his post.

It is really regrettable that Cairo has been made the venue of such a splittist meeting for the Soviet splittists to disrupt and sabotage the Afro-Asian writers' movement and the struggle of the Afro-Asian peoples.

The Soviet splittists have completely unmasked themselves when, at the illegal Cairo meeting, they proposed and decided to hold a so-called Afro-Asian writers' meeting in Baku, Soviet Azerbaijan. Thus, after establishing a fake bureau, ridiculously appointing a so-called secretary general and so forth, they go further to organize a fake Afro-Asian writers' meeting in the Soviet Union. I think, it is now clear to everyone of us that the Soviet splittists are the real culprit, the main culprit of all the disruptive activities which have been going on for some time against our movement and which have reached their climax at the Cairo splittist meeting.

After repeatedly warning them, the meeting of the Afro-Asian Writers' Bureau, held on 23 June 1966, in Peking, unanimously announced that "by such deliberate and intentional sabotaging of the Afro-Asian Writers' Movement, the splittist Soviet writers have totally divorced themselves from the ranks of the Afro-Asian writers and have forfeited

all their rights and place, forever, in the Afro-Asian Writers' Bureau.

The stand of the bureau, in this respect, is in complete conformity with the wishes and demands of the Afro-Asian writers who are greatly indignant at the sabotage activities carried out by the Soviet splittists.

Dear colleagues, I have come to the end of my report. We have been in the forefront of the Afro-Asian peoples' revolutionary movements and struggles against the U.S.-led imperialists and their lackeys. We have contributed our due share in rallying together the revolutionary writers of our two continents and in forming with them a united front against our common enemy, U.S. imperialism. This united front against U.S. imperialism can, by no means, include the lackeys and accomplices of U.S. imperialism. The revolutionary writers of Asia and Africa have been fighting not only in the battlefield but also in the field of culture, art, and literature. Through our works, we have strengthened the solidarity and the fighting spirit of Afro-Asian peoples who are resolutely fighting to liberate their lands and to win their independence and peace.

The progressive Afro-Asian writers are dedicating themselves to a noble common task of the Afro-Asian peoples. We shall fulfill this. We will go on. No force of imperialists, headed by the United States, can stop us; no force of their lackeys can stop us; no force of their collaborators can stop us; no force on earth can stop us. We will fight on; we will advance and march forward until we are completely victorious.

Thank you.

On 19 October 1957 Wang Shih-ching, responsible editor for the Complete Works of Lu Hsun, sent to a number of people the draft notes on the Complete Works of Lu Hsun, Vol. VI, under the name of the People's Literature Publishing House. In an attached letter he particularly stated that the draft note on the article "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan" was written according to what was agreed on at the meeting of the Chinese Writers Association.

Chou Yang and others were still not satisfied with the draft note. Therefore, Chou Yang, Lin Mo-han, and Shao Chuan-lin joined efforts to make a correction. From the photograph of the corrected proof one can see that they had deleted one paragraph and rewritten another paragraph. It looked as if they had two reasons for deleting the paragraph: The first is that the attack against Lu Hsun seemed too unscrupulous and that it would be disadvantageous to Chou Yang if his name were placed against Lu Hsun. The second is that they wanted the public to believe that the articles were written by Lu Hsun but made public after he consulted with Feng Hsueh-feng.

The penciled words in the corrected portion were in the handwriting of Chou Yang and those in ink that of Lin Mo-han. Much hard work has been put in on this copied document. Take a look at it. It first said that Hsu Mou-yung's letter was a personal matter and had no connection whatever with Chou Yang and the others. Although this scheme was clever, it had its crude points. Readers ignorant of the true facts would not have hit upon the connection between Hsu Mou-yung's letter and Chou Yang, but with this notation it attracted people's attention, like the sign "There are no 300 taels of silver buried here."

Second, it said that this article by Lu Hsun was authored by Feng Hsueh-feng. Lin Mo-han, the blockhead, could not even lie convincingly, noting it as a "substitute writing" of Feng Hsueh-feng. More cunning than Lin, Chou Yang corrected the word "substitute" to read "draft" and also added "(Lu Hsun)" and the four words "during the final draft." The lie was smoother but the motivation was to claim Lu Hsun's article as being written by Feng Hsueh-feng, relieving Chou Yang of the opprobrium of substituting Lu Hsun's name with another. This alteration exposed the true nature of his attack on Lu Hsun.

How self-contradictory are the prevaricators of history!

Lin Mo-han wrote a letter to Wang Shih-ching at the same time that he sent out the notations, on 15 November 1957, in which he said, "The notations on the manuscript on Lu Hsun's answer to Hsu Mou-yung have been edited in consultation with Chou Yang and your suggestions would be appreciated."

Spending a night after the letter was mailed, he felt uneasy and on the second day, 16 November, he rushed another letter to Wang Shih-ching: "I believe the corrected draft on the notations on Lu Hsun's answer to Hsu Mou-yung sent out yesterday must have been received. The second sentence in the corrected portion reading 'The underground party organization in Shanghai has no prior knowledge' is not precise; please correct it to '...the CCP at that time was in the state of working underground and its organization in the cultural circles of Shanghai had no prior knowledge.'"

This brought forth another problem. The sudden change from "the underground party organization in Shanghai" to "the CCP was in the state of working underground and its organization in the cultural circles of Shanghai" could not but bring forth such questions from the people as: What organization are you talking about? and what "state of working underground" is this?

On 2 December 1957 Lin Mo-han wrote another letter to Wang Shih-ching giving orders for the finalization of the draft. The following is the notion that distorted history:

"The CCP published a manifesto on 1 August 1935 setting forth the suggestion for a cessation of the civil war and the establishment of anti-Japanese front to the Kuomintang government, to the various parties, factions, and circles in the country, and to the people. A further decision was made in December of that year on the policy of establishing an anti-Japanese, national united front which received the support of the nation and impelled the anti-Japanese upsurge of that time. Propagandizing and building up a broad anti-Japanese, national united front became the central problem in literature and arts.

"Under the leadership of the CCP, the revolutionary literary circle took the initiative in the spring of 1936 to disband the 'Leftist League' (1563 5114) and prepared for establishment of 'The Association of Writers.' On the problem of creative writing there was conflict between the two slogans 'Literature for national defense' and 'Mass literature for national revolutionary war.' Lu Hsun in his original article and in the 'Letter in Answer to the Trotskyite Faction,' which was published in June, and in 'On Our Present Literary Movement' revealed his attitude and opinion toward the literary movement and the policy of anti-Japanese, national united front at that time.

"Hsu Mou-yung made a mistake himself by writing that letter to Lu Hsun. The CCP organization in the cultural field in Shanghai was underground by that time. It did not know at all. Lu Hsun was sick and his answer was drafted by Feng Hsueh-feng. In this article he took a sectarian attitude toward some writers who were party members leading the work of the 'Leftist League' at that time. He made some condemnation incompatible with the facts. Because of the circumstances, Lu Hsun was unable to make an investigation and check those facts when he made a final draft."

Let us lay bare this hidden and twisted writing. Frankly it meant: First, the so-called "organization of the CCP in cultural circles of Shanghai" was Chou Yang and his ilk. Their art and literary line and their slogan about "literature for national defense" were correct and compatible with the party's policy of a national united front against the Japanese. Second, in regard to Lu Hsun's attitude and opinion toward the policy of national united front against the Japanese and the literature movement, Lu Hsun's slogan "Mass literature for the national revolutionary war" was mistaken and sectarian.

Let us see how Comrade Mao Tse-tung summed up the struggle between the two classes and the two lines on the cultural front in the "thirties" and the struggle for seizing the leadership on the cultural front between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, and how Lu Hsun handled the struggle, as well as how Chou Yang and his ilk turned history upside down in the note and how they opposed Mao Tse-tung's thought and attacked communist Lu Hsun.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung summed up in "On New Democracy" the struggle on the cultural front between 1927 and 1937 like this: "This period was on the one hand a period of counterrevolutionary campaigns of encirclement and suppression, and on the other a period of the deepening of the revolutionary movement. There were then two kinds of campaigns of encirclement and suppression: military encirclement and suppression and cultural encirclement and suppression. There was also the deepening of two kinds of revolution: The deepening of the agrarian revolution and the deepening of the cultural revolution. At the instigation of the imperialists, all the reactionary forces of China and of the world were mobilized for both campaigns of encirclement and suppression, which lasted less than 10 years and which were unprecedented throughout the world in cruelty -- hundreds of thousands of communists and young students were slaughtered, and millions of the worker-peasant masses were persecuted.

"To the people responsible for all this, it seemed that communism and the communists could certainly be suppressed and annihilated once and for all. However, the result was the opposite: Both kinds of campaigns of encirclement and suppression failed miserably. The outcome of the military campaigns was the northern march of the Red Army to resist the Japanese, and the outcome of the cultural campaigns was the outbreak of the 9 December movement of revolutionary youth in 1935. And the common result of both campaigns was the awakening of the people of the whole country. All these three events were positive results.

"The strangest thing of all was: As the Communist Party was in an utterly defenseless position in all the cultural institutions in the KMT-controlled areas, why did the KMT cultural campaigns also completely fall to the ground? Does this not give food for prolonged and profound thought? And it was in the very midst of such campaigns of encirclement and suppression that Lu Hsun the communist grew to be the giant of China's cultural revolution."(1)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's saying here clearly answered two questions in the history of struggle on the cultural front during this period: First, a summing up of the struggle between the enemy and us on the cultural front; a complete failure of the "encirclement and suppression" of the counterrevolutionary culture, and the deepening and development of the cultural revolution.

Second, a summary of the struggle between the two roads within the revolutionary cultural front: representing the correct direction was the fighting leftwing literary and art movement led by Lu Hsun. Lu Hsun, the communist, had become a great figure in the Chinese cultural revolution during the counterrevolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression."

During this historical period Chou Yang and his ilk had followed an opportunist line opposing Mao Tse-tung's thought. In the early period it was Wang Ming's left opportunist line. In the later period it became Wang Ming's rightist opportunist line. They were not genuine communists but rather bourgeois democrats. The genuine communist was in fact Lu Hsun, who came under their attack. As Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out: "Representing the great majority of the nation, Lu Hsun breached and stormed the enemy citadel; on the cultural front he was the most correct, the bravest, the firmest and most loyal, and the most ardent national hero, without parallel in history. The road he took was the very road of Chin's new national culture."(2)

Obviously, the tragic failure of the counterrevolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression" and the in-depth penetration of the cultural revolution amounted to a victory of the new cultural direction of the Chinese national represented by Lu Hsun, and not a victory for the opportunist line represented by Chou Yang. The opportunist line was a complete failure.

Associated with the struggle between the two lines was the debate between the two slogans on "national defense literature" and "popular literature of the national revolutionary war." The slogan "national defense literature" was put forward by Chou Yang in compliance with Wang Ming's right opportunist line, whose characteristics were to abolish the class struggle, abandon proletarian leadership, rely on the landlord bourgeoisie, and reject "capitulationism of one class to another." This slogan ran squarely counter to comrade Mao Tse-tung's thought on the national united front for resistance against Japan and was an out-and-out bourgeois slogan.

In his "On New Democracy" Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "Since the Chinese revolution today cannot do without proletarian leadership, China's new culture cannot do without the leadership of proletarian culture and ideology, of communist ideology."(3)

This slogan "national defense literature" was designed precisely to do away with the CCP leadership and the leadership of proletarian culture and ideology and of communist ideology. Putting such a slogan into effect, the so-called national defense literature championed by Chou Yang and his ilk would inevitably follow the literature of big landlord bourgeoisie which subjugated itself to imperialism.

"Sai Chin Hua," written by Hsia Yen and hailed by Chou Yang at that time as having presented the "most central theme" and having "opened up a realm for national defense drama," is a specimen of the "national defense literature."(4)

Great communist Lu Hsun strongly criticized this specimen. He wrote: "The composition had the 'most central theme.' Even Sai Chin Hua of the Boxer Rebellion period, who was the mistress of German supreme commander (Watehsi--phonetic), for a while was hailed as the country-protecting goddess in high heaven."(5)

Lu Hsun was completely right; the "most central theme" presented by Chou Yang and his ilk was precisely the theme of capitulationism. The "national defense literature" championed by Chou Yang and his ilk was actually the literature of capitulationism. Comrade Mu Hsin thoroughly analyzed and criticized this in his article "Comment on the Reactionary Ideology in the Drama 'Sai Chin Hua.'"(6)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out: "Class capitulationism is actually the reserve force of national capitulationism in the anti-Japanese national revolutionary war; it is a vile tendency that lends support to the rightwing camp and leads to defeat in the war."(7)

The practice of the "national defense literature" during the late "thirties" fully bore out Comrade Mao Tse-ting's brilliant assertion.

The slogan in opposition to this bourgeois slogan "national defense literature" is "popular literature on the national revolutionary war" put forward by Lu Hsun.

Lu Hsun, emphasized the leading responsibility of the proletarian cultural thinking on the cultural united front. He pointed out: "Far from abandoning its responsibility of class leadership, revolutionary literature areas to increase and expand its responsibility."(8)

He also held that within the national united front, criticism should also be conducted on bourgeois literature.

In writing a number of articles and letters during this period Lu Hsun used this sharp weapon of class analysis of the proletariat to criticize, while struggling against imperialism and the KMT reactionary, the mistakes created by this bourgeois slogan of "national defense literature," especially the dangerous tendency of advocating class consonance and eliminating class struggle by using the name of the united front. The greatness of Lu Hsun was that after becoming a communist, he never forgot class and class struggle.

With Mao Tse-tung's thought to summarize the history of the left literature and art movement during the "thirties" in areas under KMT control, the following are noted:

A proletarian literature and art line represented by Lu Hsun;

A bourgeois literature and art line represented by Chou Yang;

A proletarian slogan: popular literature on the national revolutionary war;

A bourgeois slogan: national defense literature.

The explanatory note to "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan" was in opposition to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's historical summation. It described the wrong line as a correct one and vice versa, and described the bourgeois slogan as a proletarian slogan and vice versa.

What is worth noting is that, while playing the trick on reversing history, Chou Yang and his ilk adopted underhanded methods to deceive the people. They attacked Lu Hsun's "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan" as "sectarianism" on the one hand, and hypocritically claimed on the other hand that this article was drafted and written by Feng Hsueh-feng (7458 7185 1496) and that since Lu Hsun was sick at that time, it was impossible for him to investigate the matter, and so on and so forth. This was sheer nonsense! This was a slander on Lu Hsun!

Did Lu Hsun become so sick and muddleheaded that he could not even do anything when others imposed the ideas of "sectarianism" on him? Chou Yang and his ilk really underestimated the capability of the masses in distinguishing things: Those who have read Lu Hsun's articles and letters can easily see that although Lu Hsun was sick at that time, he never slackened the struggle against class capitulationism.

Lu Hsun recognized and carried out the party policy concerning the national united front against Japan from a communist standpoint; therefore, he was able to see through with his sharp eyes, (the tricks of--ed.) certain opportunists who cried loudly the slogan about the united front but who in reality advocated class capitulationism, and to expose them penetratingly and conduct sharp criticism against them.

Like other articles of Lu Hsun during this period, "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan" was entirely Lu Hsun's own thinking. In his diary of 5 August 1936, Lu Hsun wrote clearly: "Completed in the evening the article in reply to Hsu Mou-yung." (9)

It was complete rumormongering to say that such an important article of Lu Hsun's was written by Feng Hsueh-feng. This was an extremely vicious method adopted by them for the purpose of overthrowing Lu Hsun.

In order to attain the goal of deceiving the readers, Chou Yang and his ilk played another fraud.

After publishing "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan," Lu Hsun repeatedly mentioned in letters to his friends his writing of this article. But these important letters were deliberately taken out of the "Complete Works of Lu Hsun" by these guilty-minded gentlemen. To lay bare this fraud we hereby cite a few letters, such as:

In a letter written on 28 August 1936 he said: "...it was precisely because I did not join the association that the immortals (chun hsien 5028 0103) tried vigorously to encircle and suppress me; knowing only too well that I was seriously ill not long ago, Hsu Mou-yung also appeared at my door with an arrogant air.

"In fact, although he was the only one who wrote this letter, it speaks for a certain group of people. One can see through it easily by reading it carefully and noting the tone used in the letter. Therefore, I think it is all the more necessary for me to make an open reply. If it is a merely personal affair which has nothing to do with the whole situation, then why was it necessary to print the arguments? Saying that in dealing with this matter I was 'spending my energy in vain' is not absolutely true. A glare of light can thoroughly expose the true features of the demons hiding in the shade of the great evil banner (ta tu 1129 4966). The effects can be seen from what has happened to some small-newspapers in Shanghai in recent days; they have finally exposed their true features in front of everyone."(10)

Another letter was written on 15 September 1936. He said: "In Shanghai now only the weather is no good, the literary atmosphere is also unpalatable. What was cited in my article (NCNA note: "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan") is but a very small part of it. There are literary men here who are in fact the so-called 'blackguards' in Tientsin. They used the method of spreading rumors, threatening, and sowing discord to lure the young people, who love literature but do not know too much about it, to become their supporters; as to production, they do not have any. What they are good at is nothing but making a lot of noise. Hsu Mou-yung, for example, was so arrogant so to threaten me with the words 'to settle the problem practically.'

"It can, therefore, be easily imagined how he was treated by the young people. They formed a gang to control the literary circles and make a mess of them. When I recover from my sickness, I will continue to expose them for the sake of the future of Chinese literature and art. Now they are using 'small newspapers' to hurt me. It only shows how incompetent they are."(11)

Still another letter was written on the evening of 15 October 1936, four days before Lu Hsun died. He said in the letter: "...In order not to make trouble, I tried not to mind other's business but to devote myself to translation work to make a living. That is why I have not turned out too many works this year. I was seriously ill later and stayed in bed for several months. Taking advantage of my sickness, these small clowns came out of their hiding places to launch a vigorous attack. I could not but write some short articles in bed as a lesson to them. Although these fellows are clumsy, they are after all harmful to the minds of the people. You simply cannot imagine how bad the literary climate is in Shanghai in recent years -- there is almost no taste of a human being."(12)

In these letters Lu Hsun clearly indicated that "In reply to Hsu Mou-yung with regard to the question of the united front against Japan" was by no means a "personal affair which has nothing to do with the whole situation," but was a cardinal issue of right and wrong which affected "the future of China's literature and art," and a sharp struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie on the literary front to fight for leadership.

From these letters we can see that for the interests of the proletariat and for the sake of the masses Lu Hsun displayed bitter hatred against Chou Yang and his ilk. Even when his illness became critical, Lu Hsun declared at the top of his voice: "When I feel better I will continue to expose them!"

It is beyond doubt that if Lu Hsun had lived longer he would have carried out to the end the struggle against this literature and art line of bourgeois capitulationism represented by Chou Yang.

These and other important letters of Lu Hsun's criticizing the slogan of "national defense literature" and the closed-door-ism and secretarianism of Chou Yang and his ilk were included in "letters of Lu Hsun" compiled by Comrade Hsu Kuang-ping.

The following words were seen in the "publishing note" in volume one of the new edition of the Complete Works of Lu Hsun published in October 1956: "All the letters newly collected are included in this edition." But in October 1958 when Vol. IX, "letter portion," of the works, was published, the "publishing note" was changed as follows: "The letters included in this edition are a selection from the 855 letters collected up to 1946 and the 310 letters collected later. We chose the significant ones and laid aside the ordinary social letters. A total of 334 letters has been selected and published."

What a "choosing" of the "significant ones"! What a "laying aside" of the "ordinary social letters"! Were these letters really "ordinary social letters" of little significance? Let everybody make a comment on it!

We also want Chou Yang to answer this: Why did you not let these letters be included? Was it not that you were afraid of exposure of the true features of you "demons" and "clowns"? The real intention of Chou Yang, who desperately concealed the truth and reversed history, was to try to reverse the history of the literature and art movement of the "thirties" in an attempt to seize leadership of today's literary and art circles.

Chou Yang and his ilk styled themselves as "leftists" during the period of democratic revolution, but in fact they were rightists.

Since the sixth session of the sixth Central Committee of the party in 1938, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has several times criticized them. But Chou Yang and his ilk only accepted it superficially but refused it in heart. They played the dual tactics of carrying a red flag to oppose the red flag to deceive the party and the people.

After China's revolution entered the socialist stage their vicious activities opposing the party and Chairman Mao, instead of coming to an end, became even more raging and wild. They showed ostensible obedience to Mao Tse-tung's thought on literature and art and to the many important struggles on the literature and art and to the many important struggles on the literary and art front personally led by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and adopted all kinds of schemes to resist and undermine them.

In the course of the struggle against the rightists in 1957, they covered up their own rightist political countenance and made use of the leadership positions they had usurped in the literary and art circles to put up the false signboard of opposing rightist Feng Hsueh-feng in an attempt to knock down Lu Hsun and enable the great rightist Chou Yang to come to the throne of "venerable master" in literature and art circles.

While publishing the explanatory note to preserve history, Chou Yang also wrote an article entitled "A Great Debate on the Literature and Art Front." This article, under the signboard of summing up the experience in the struggle against the rightists in literature and art circles, contained a number of "nails." The most vicious nail was the attempt to reverse the previous correct decisions concerning the struggle between the two roads on the literature and art front of the "thirties." In the name of criticizing rightist Feng Hsueh-feng, they beat around the bush and indirectly vilified the party and Chairman Mao for their criticism of the black literature and art line of the "thirties."

Immediately after that, a group of prominent figures held a "symposium" on Chou Yang's article, vigorously extolling Chou Yang. This was a "symposium" in opposition to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's "talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art." The sixth issue of WEN I PAO on 26 March 1958 carried the speeches made at this "symposium" under the title "paving the way for the great leap forward of literature and art."

Lin Mo-han, Shao Chuan-lin, Yuan Shui-po, and others made speeches unanimously suggesting a summing up of the struggle between the two roads on the literary and art front according to the "basis" of Chou Yang's article. Lin Mo-han said this article "not only summarized the result of last year's antirightist struggle in the field of literature and art, but also analyzed the historical and class sources of the differences and disputes in the left literary and art movement."(13)

Shao Chuan-lin said, "By employing good reasoning and finding out the root and laws of the struggle, this article successfully summed up the historical experience on the struggle between the two roads in China's proletarian literary and art movement which lasted over 30 years."(14)

Chairman Mao's articles "On New Democracy" and "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Art and Literature" had already completely, thoroughly, and systematically made the historical summing up of the struggle between the two roads on the cultural front.

After China's revolution entered the state of socialism, Comrade Mao Tse-tung again publicized his two articles "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" and "Speech at the CCP National Conference on Propaganda Work," which constituted the most up-to-date summing up of the historical experience of the revolutionary ideological movements and the literary and art movements in China and in various countries.

But Lin Mo-han and others held that Comrade Mao Tse-tung had not provided us with "a foundation to clarify and sum up" the struggle, and demanded all concerned to "base" themselves upon Chou Yang's article to sum up once again the struggle between the two roads on the front of literature and art in antagonism with Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Shao Chuan-lin also asked people to rewrite the modern history of literature and art in line with the orientation put forward by Chou Yang.(15)

They adulterated the modern history of literature and art to promote the bourgeois line of literature and art and to topple the proletarian line of literature and art.

The speeches delivered by Yuan Shui-po and others directly pointed their spearhead at Comrade Mao Tse-tung's "Talks at the Yen-an Forum of Literature and Art." Under the pretext of the change of the era, they sought to use the "new things" in Chou Yang's article to "explain with notes" and "bring into full play" Comrade Mao Tse-tung's talks so as to "further enrich Marxist-Leninist theories on literature and art." They sought to use the antiparty and antisocialist black line of combining the bourgeois and modern revisionist ideas on literature and art with the so-called literature and art of the "thirties" to exercise dictatorship over proletarian literature and art.

The note in the Complete Works of Lu Hsun and the forum in praise of Chou Yang coordinated with each other in a planned and organized manner to unleash a frenzied attack on the party and Mao Tse-tung's thought. They mapped out a revisionist program on literature and art against Mao Tse-tung's line of literature and art in an effort to heighten Chou Yang's position in the control of the field of literature and art.

Henceforth becoming brazen and truculent, Chou Yang delivered (speeches--ed.) and wrote articles in various newspapers throughout the country, spreading poisonous weeds and recruiting rebels. He openly hoisted a big black flag against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought and became unscrupulously antagonistic to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's line of literature and art.

Politically, Chou Yang was the "ringleader" of the black literature and art line, which is against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought. He did all he could to oppose the class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, opposed literature and art which serve the workers, peasants, and soldiers, and vigorously advocated "literature and art of the whole people," which means the reactionary literature and art of capitalism, feudalism, and revisionism.

He viciously attacked the so-called "class labelism," saying that "labelism is to put the label of classes on all things; for example, this is of the bourgeoisie and this is of the proletariat, as if all men are divided into classes and conform to class nature ... where do we have so many classes?"

He also said: "Resonance and class nature are not closely related to each other. The arts of a certain class are not produced just for that particular class. They are produced for all the classes so as to create resonance from among all the people. Naturally, it is something else as to whether or not this resonance can be created." He said: "Works of art can be accepted by any class. Works of art produced by a certain class should be appreciated by all classes. Otherwise they are a failure. Some art works represent the interests of a certain class as well as the interests of the whole people."

This is an out-and-out bourgeois and revisionist theory on literature and art. During the "thirties" Chou Yang advanced a "literature of national defense" and a "literature of the whole Chinese nation," which do away with classes. He picked up what Khrushchev left over in his "party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people," and under a new situation he formed an even more thorough and systematic black line of literature and art against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought, and made strenuous efforts to peddle it throughout the country.

In the past 10 and more years since the founding of the CPR, the great number of reactionary fallacies in the field of literature and art such as the theory of "truthful waiting," the theory of opposition to "subject matter as the decisive factor," the theory of "middle characters," and so on, all stemmed from Chou Yang's black line of literature and art. In the past the Ministry of Culture refused to carry out Chairman Mao's line on literature and art, turning itself into a ministry of emperors, kings, generals, ministers, scholars, and beauties. It made strenuous efforts to promote the reactionary literature and art of capitalism, feudalism, and revisionism and became the tool of the bourgeoisie in exercising dictatorship over the proletariat. This situation was inseparable from the ruling by Chou Yang's black line on literature and art.

Many associations of the All-China Federation of Literature and Art Circles became organizations like the revisionist Petofi Club in Hungary. This is the bad result of promoting Chou Yang's black line on literature and art. It was under the guidance of Chou Yang's black line on literature and art that a great number of bad art works, films, dramas, and music spread poison throughout the country. All these were aimed at preparing public opinion for the restoration of capitalism.

Organizationally, Chou Yang was the "ringleader" of the black gang of literature and art against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought. He stubbornly held fast to the bourgeois organizational line of sectarianism which he had implemented in the thirties.

He took advantage of the leading position he occupied for a long time to put his own men into many literary and art organizations throughout China. He had a small circle of men working for him. They were either the bourgeois literary and art "old hands" who held fast to the erroneous line with him in the "thirties," or students nurtured with his bourgeois and revisionist ideas on literature and art. He also recruited a number of feudal remnants, rebels, special agents, and bourgeois reactionary "authorities" in the academic field to form a black gang in the literary and art circles against the party, against socialism, and against Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Between the late "fifties" and early "sixties," when our country was temporarily suffering from natural calamities, and the Khrushchev revisionist clique was making trouble for us, a blast of black wind under the control of Chou Yang's black line swept literature and art circles throughout the whole country. This is the revival and development of the opportunist literature and art line of the "thirties." In coordination with the reactionaries at home and abroad, such a revival and development has a stronger antiparty, antisocialist political force. The tentacles of such a revival and development have reached the domains of the literature departments of universities and the fields of drama, cinematography, literature, music, journalism, and publishing in which to spread its poison. This is a reactionary adverse political current which has been formed with systematic collaboration and under careful plan and command. The great proletarian cultural revolution launched and led by the CCP Central Committee and Chairman Mao has made clear the class struggle within the realm of ideology, and unmasked the black line's control over the literature and art circles, thus revealing the true countenance of Chou Yang and his ilk. We must carry through to the end the great struggle for safeguarding the party, socialism, and Mao Tse-tung's thought, and ruthlessly topple the Chou Yang-led literature and art black line and black gang who are against the party, socialism, and Mao Tse-tung's thought. Under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought on literature and art we can certainly establish a brand new proletarian socialist culture!

Following are the footnote references in this article:

1. Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, second edition, People's Publishing House, 1952, Vol. II, p. 695.
2. "On New Democracy" from Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II, p. 691.
3. Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II, p. 698.
4. "On National Defense Literature" and "Literature for the Present Stage" from About the National Defense Literature by Chou Yang, Shanghai Hsinchao Publishing House, 1936, pp. 128 and 174.
5. "This Is Also Life ..." from Lu Hsun's Anthology, People's Publishing House, 1958, Vol. VI, p. 487.
6. Kwangming Daily, 12 March 1966.
7. "The situation and our tasks of the war of resistance against Japan after Shanghai and Taiyuan were taken" from Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II, p. 387.

8. "On Our Present-Day Literature and Art Movement" from Lu Hsun's Anthology, Vol. VI, p. 475.
9. Lu Hsun's Diary, People's Literature and Art Publishing House, 1959, Vol. II, p. 1129.
- 10 and 11. Lu Hsun's Letters, People's Literature and Art Publishing House, 1952, Vol. II, pp. 710-711, 974-975.
12. Lu Hsun's Letters, People's Literature and Art Publishing House, 1952, Vol. II, p. 139.
13. "The Great Debate on the Literature and Art Front," by Chou Yang and others, Writers Publishing House, 1958, p. 1099.
- 14, 15, and 16. "The Great Debate on the Literature and Art Front," by Chou Yang and others, pp. 52, 55, 91 and 105.

CSO: 3530-D



"NATIONAL DEFENSE LITERATURE" IS A SLOGAN OF
WANG MING'S RIGHT OPPORTUNIST LINE

Following is a translation of an article by Mu Hsin in the Chinese-language periodical Hung-Ch'i (Red Flag), No. 9, 1 July 1966.

At present an unprecedentedly great proletarian cultural revolution is taking shape in all parts of our country; under the leadership of the party, vast numbers of revolutionary art and literary workers of the proletariat are enthusiastically taking part in this great struggle on the ideological front.

The Liberation Army Daily has pointed out, in the editorial entitled "Hold aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and take an active part in the great socialist cultural revolution" of 18 April this year, that "ever since the founding of new China, an antiparty line has existed in the literary and art circles, a black antisocialist line that runs counter to Mao Tse-tung's thought.

It is a conglomeration of bourgeois and modern revisionist conceptions of literature and art, and of what is presumed to have been the "literature and art of the 1930's." The pressing task of our country's art and literary workers at the present moment is to destroy this anti-party and antisocialist black line and eliminate once and for all its influence.

Where does this black line come from? When did it start? Who are the representatives of this black line?

To answer these questions it is imperative to start with the so-called "literature and art of the 1930's" -- which has been lauded to the skies by some persons in the past few years.

1. An "explanatory note" which was published for the purpose of distorting and revising the history of China's revolutionary literature as well as openly hoisting a black flag of revisionist art and literature:

In the summer of 1936, debates over two slogans took place in the leftwing art and literary movement in the Kuomintang-controlled areas, with Shanghai as its center -- namely, the so-called "National defense literature" put forward by Comrade Chou Yang and the "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war" put forward by Lu Hsun.

This argument, which was a major event on the art and literary front in the 1930's, reflected the class struggle of society within the leftwing art and literary movement at that time. It also manifested the struggle between the correct line on the art and literary front within the party, headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and the right opportunist line, headed by Wang Ming.

Proceeding from different stands, one would definitely draw drastically different conclusions on these two slogans in the 1930's.

In an explanatory note "In answer to Hsu Mou-yung's question on the united front against Japan" in the sixth volume of the "Complete Works of Lu Hsun," published by the People's Literature Publishing House in April 1958, a conclusion that completely runs counter to historical facts was made.

It says: This article was first carried in the fifth issue of the first volume of the monthly WRITERS in August 1936. On 1 August 1935, the Chinese Communist Party issued a declaration, calling on the KMT government and the various parties, groups, and the people of all circles throughout the country to stop the civil war and unite as one to fight against Japan; in December of the same year, it went a step further by formulating the policy of establishing a national united front against Japan.

The decision, warmly supported by the people throughout the country, created a direct impetus to the stormy struggle against Japan at that time. Moreover, the central issue at that time was to propagate and form a national united front against Japan as broad as possible in the art and literary circles; in the spring of 1936, the revolutionary literary workers led by the CCP had already voluntarily dissolved the "Union of Leftwing Writers" and prepared to form the "Association of Art and Literary Workers" to carry on the debate over the slogans "National defense literature" and "Mass literature of national revolutionary war" in the field of literary creation.

Through this article and other articles "In Reply to Trotsky's Group" and "On Our Literary Movement," which were published in June, Lu Hsun expressed his attitude and opinions on the policy of forming a national united front against Japan and the literary movement at that time.

It was a wrong move on the part of Hsu Mou-yung's to write to Lu Hsun, because the CCP organizations, which remained underground at that time, in the cultural field of Shanghai were not notified beforehand.

Lu Hsun was ill at that time, and the reply was drafted by Feng Hsueh-feng. In this article he adopted the sectarianist attitude toward some party writers who were responsible for the work of the "Union of Leftwing Writers" and made some comments not in compliance with the facts. Owing to the circumstances at that time, it was impossible for Lu Hsun to do any investigation or proofreading when he made the final review of the script.

But now it is known to everyone that this explanatory note was formulated completely in accordance with the desire of Chou Yang, and also revised personally by himself, Lin Mo-han, and Shao Chuan-lin.

With a touch by such an "authority" as Chou Yang, the note created a tremendously deep and detrimental influence. Acting on the leading position he had usurped, Chou Yang's appraisal of these two slogans has become a unified standard for the literary critique and the study of the literary history of our country, and also created the groundwork for advocating the "literature and art of the 1930's."

What is most serious is the fact that they, through this explanatory note and a series of insidious activities, have hoisted a black bourgeois flag against the party, socialism, and the thought of Mao Tse-tung in our country's art and literary circles. This is the art-literary line of revisionism represented by Chou Yang.

Owing to the influence of the black line of the "literature and art in the 1930's" represented by Chou Yang, the modern histories and other historical materials published in China since liberation have unanimously failed to make any accurate appraisal of the two slogans of the 1930's.

All discussions and interpretations of these two slogans made in the relevant materials, which were published after the "basic conception" of this note in the Complete Works of Lu Hsun was established in 1958, are based on the standard set forth in this note, thereby turning the history upside down.

All these books state that the slogan of "National defense literature" is correct; it is also a "Marxist slogan" "put forward by the party."

The books point out that the slogan "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war" is wrong; it is also a "revisionist slogan" put forward by a group of persons (such as Hu Feng, Feng Hsueh-feng, and their ilk) who took the trouble to "split" the art and literary circles at that time and to deceive Lu Hsun.

A note "reference data concerning the modern literary history of China" compiled by the journalism department of the Chinese People's University and published in June 1958 states:

"Before and after the 'Union of Leftwing Writers' was voluntarily dissolved in the spring of 1936, a slogan regarding 'literature of national defense' as the central task of the united front in art and literary circles was put forward in response to the CCP's call for establishing a national united front against Japan, and afterward a debate developed over the slogans 'National defense literature' and 'Mass literature of the national revolutionary war.'"

The debate, started on account of the schemes and instigations of Feng Hsueh-feng, Hu Feng, and their ilk, resulted in the splitting of the revolutionary art and literary movement.

The book Proletarian Revolutionary Literature During the Period of the "Union of Leftwing Writers," compiled by the Chinese Literature Department of Nanking University and published in March 1960, turns history upside down to an almost ridiculously fallacious extent.

It states: "'National defense literature' completely conforms to the party's policy of forming a national united front against Japan. It is an actual practice of the party's policy of forming a national united front against Japan on the art and literary front."

Meanwhile, the book adds that "the slogan of 'mass literature of national revolutionary war' represents a revisionist line."

The note by Chou Yang and the history of modern Chinese literature written under the influence of this note completely confounded black and white, describing the correct line as an erroneous line and the erroneous line as a correct line and presenting Marxism as revisionism and revisionism as Marxism.

The political intrigue hidden behind this note must be thoroughly exposed and the historical truth which had been altered and reversed must be reversed again to its original place.

2. "National defense literature" was a bourgeois slogan, and a product of the Wang Ming right opportunist line. The contention between the two slogans, "National defense literature" and "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war," was unfolded at a critical moment when the Chinese nation was facing a life-and-death struggle, and centered around the question of the anti-Japanese national united front in the literary and art circles.

In 1931 Japanese imperialism occupied northeast China. Later, particularly after 1935, it moved in deeper and stepped up and enlarged its aggression against China. The intrusion of Japanese imperialism sharpened to the greatest extent the contradictions between Japanese imperialism and the Chinese nation, causing a new change in the class relationship at home. On the basis of an analysis on the new situation, Comrade Mao Tse-tung formulated the line of anti-Japanese national united front with an accent on unity and struggle.

Between June and August 1936, Chou Yang published a series of three articles: "On a Literature of National Defense," "Literature at the Present Stage," and "A Talk with M. Mao Tun on the Slogan of a Literature of National Defense" in the magazines Literary World (Wen Hsueh Chieh) and Light (Kuang Ming) to elaborate on his views on the literary united front.

In these articles he brandished the signal flag of the so-called "National defense literature." He stressed that a "National defense literature" was "a literature of the whole Chinese nation" but did not say one word about the proletarian leadership. He said: "The purpose of the movement of a literature of national defense is to call upon writers of all strata and different schools to stand on the side of the national united front and to create literary and art works relating to the national revolution in concerted efforts. The main theme of national defense should be the most central theme of the works of all writers, except the traitors."(1)

In essence, the contents of "a literature of national defense" advocated by Chou Yang were based on the Wang Ming right opportunist line. Wang Ming published an article in 1935 entitled "On the revolutionary movements in colonies and semicolonies and the strategy of the Communist Party." This article explained the anti-imperialist united front from the standpoint of right opportunism, basically denied the proletarian leadership, laid stress on the common interests of the whole nation, and advocated class capitulationism.

Chou Yang preached the same theme. In the name of establishing an anti-Japanese national united front, Chou Yang had completely done away with class struggle. He publicized that to set up a united front,

it was necessary pleasingly to serve the landlords, the bureaucrats, and the bourgeoisie, and to abandon the proletarian principles; he exaggerated the influence of the bourgeois writers and the role they played, and advocated doing away with the leading role of the proletarian revolutionary literature.

He was of the view that a literary united front could be formed readily and naturally and that, within it, the direction could only be one of opposing the left, not the right. He also distorted the world outlook and leadership over literary creation. This is an out-and-out capitulationist line and a revisionist literary and art program true to its name.

Aiming at the error of class capitulationism under this slogan "National defense literature," Lu Hsun put forward a clear slogan "Mass literature of national revolutionary war" by raising aloft the banner of proletarian revolutionary literature. He explained in great detail and with clarity the meaning of this slogan in his article "On Our Literary Movement Today" written on 10 June 1936.

Lu Hsun said: The "Union of Leftwing Writers" has led and fought for the movement of proletarian revolutionary literature over the past five and six years. This literature and the movement have developed unceasingly; they have been embodied and developed into a mass literature of the national revolutionary war through actual struggle.

Mass literature of the national revolutionary war is the product of the development of the proletarian revolutionary literature; it represents the true and vast contents of the proletarian revolutionary literature at the present moment. This kind of literature, which exists at the present moment, will be cultivated in the course of actual life of fighting based on the current foundation, and come into full bloom in the future.

Therefore, the putting forward of a new slogan should not be regarded as the discontinuation of the revolutionary literature movement, nor should it be considered as the "end of the movement." This definitely does not mean to stop the bloody struggle against fascism and all reactionaries, but to carry out the struggle in a more penetrating, practical, and thoroughgoing way and expand it on a still wider scale, to develop the struggle into a movement against Japanese aggression and all traitors, and to integrate all kinds of struggle into the main current of resisting Japanese aggression and opposing all traitors.

Furthermore, this definitely does not mean that the revolutionary literature should abandon its responsibility of class leadership; on the contrary, it means that the responsibility of revolutionary literature

must be increased and expanded to such an extent so that all Chinese people, irrespective of class and political party, would unanimously fight against the foreign power.

This national stand is the true class stand. The Chinese followers of Trotsky are so foolish that they do not even understand this point. However, some of my comrades in arms also have the opposite "dream," and I think that they are extremely foolish, (Lu Hsun concluded-- ed.).

The slogan put forward by Lu Hsun is a slogan of the proletariat, and the line he represented is the art and literary line of the proletariat.

Having heard Lu Hsun's slogan "Mass Literature of the National Revolutionary War," Chou Yang immediately took steps to attack it. He held that this slogan put forward by Lu Hsun "obstructs the united front in the literary field" and that it should not even be regarded as a "supplementary slogan for the 'National defense literature.'"

Chou Yang said: "Aside from the slogan 'National defense literature,' other supplementary slogans in the same category may also be allowed to exist so long as they do not obstruct the literary united front movement. However, 'Mass literature of the national revolutionary war' was put forward under opposite conditions."

He clamored that "It is unnecessary to put forward other slogans beside the 'national defense literature,' for they may run counter to the literary united front movement." He also labeled Lu Hsun as a "sectarianist" by saying: "Mr. Lu Hsun has said that 'mass literature of the national revolutionary war' is the development of the proletarian revolutionary literature at the present moment ... It cannot be regarded as a slogan for the united front of literature at the present stage. The 'left' sectarianists should also stop making their boastful talks."

Afterward, some of Chou Yang's followers such as Hsu Mou-yung, Chang Keng, and others immediately wrote many articles to "encircle and suppress" Lu Hsun. A person named Hu Lo declared: "Anyone who opposed, obstructed, or distorted the literature of national defense is our enemy."

Another follower of Chou Yang went so far as to vilify the slogan "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war" put forward by Lu Hsun as "guilty." He said: "If the ordinary masses of people who do not understand the general situation and the people who do not understand collective struggle took this action, they certainly should be answered by more than a blaming voice and by being described as

'shameless': but if the action was taken by the people who used to style themselves as progressive, then we would rather use the word 'guilty' to describe them"(3)

However, among the curses made by those advocating "National defense literature," the most vicious one was that infamous letter to Lu Hsun written by Hsu Mou-yung on 1 August in the same year. Look! What bitter hatred was shown by Chou Yang and his ilk toward the great communist Lu Hsun and the proletarian slogan "mass literature of the national revolutionary war!" They set themselves against Lu Hsun and launched a vicious attack and slander against Lu Hsun.

The frenzied "encirclement and suppression" by Chou Yang and his ilk against Lu Hsun ended with disastrous failure and served only to expose their own revisionist features. The slogan "national defense literature" put forward by Chou Yang was a slogan of Wang Ming's right opportunism. Having abandoned the proletarian stand and eliminated proletarian leadership, it was out-and-out class capitulation and openly betrayed the interests of the proletariat.

But Lu Hsun held high the banner of "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war" in the struggle and persisted in a correct direction; he is worthy of being called "the greatest and the most heroic banner-holder" of China's new cultural movement.

In attacking the slogan "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war," Chou Yang and his ilk attacked Lu Hsun almost with one voice, saying that he "did not understand" the political situation which had been changed, and "did not understand" the policy of national united front against Japan adopted by the party under this new situation. They even falsely accused Lu Hsun of "undermining the united front."

Chou Yang said: "Most of the people who are in doubt about literature of national defense do not agree about the nature of the whole nation in literature of national defense.

"They can neither see the rapid changes of the relationship among various strata of society during the time when a nation is having difficulties, nor understand that the intellectuals of the petit bourgeois are the reliable allies in the national revolution."

He added: "The center of the mistakes of those who oppose a literature of national defense is that they do not understand the important significance of the national revolutionary united front."

In fact, Lu Hsun was the one who understood most clearly the significance of the united front against Japan and Chou Yang and a handful of his enthusiastic followers were the ones who did not understand it.

The "center of the mistakes" of those advocating "national defense literature" was that they took Wang Ming's right opportunist stand and distorted the active revolutionary policy formulated by the party under the new situation as a line of class capitulationism.

The articles published by Chou Yang at that time were full of servile flattery to curry favor with the bourgeois. He did so out of fear that Lu Hsun's clear-cut proletarian stand might scare the bourgeois writers.

Chou Yang said in his article "On a Literature of National Defense" that if "the literature of the hard-working masses" is overemphasized, "it would mean narrowing the base and the scope of the current literature on national salvation, and separating the revolutionary literature from its friendly ranks and leading it to an absolutely isolated position."

He desperately satirized those who persisted in the proletarian stand, saying, "If one stubbornly maintains his 'purity' for fear of being influenced by the 'multiform confusing scenes' he is 'eliminating himself'!"

The fundamental question concerning the united front is the one of leadership. Comrade Mao Tse-tung taught us: "Just as the present Chinese revolution cannot be separated from the leadership of the Chinese proletariat, so the present new culture of China cannot be separated from the leadership of the ideas of China's proletarian culture, of communist ideology."(4)

He pointed out in particular that in the united front, "we must pointedly raise the question of who is to lead and must resolutely oppose capitulationism."(5)

The carrying out of Wang Ming's right opportunist line and the putting forward of the slogan "National defense literature" by Chou Yang and his ilk mean precisely the abandoning of the leadership position of the proletariat and the eliminating of the leadership of communist ideology.

In his three articles written at that time about "literature of national defense," Chou Yang talked only of the united front and the nature of "the whole nation" in "literature of national defense," without mentioning the leadership role of the proletariat.

Among the articles published at that time advocating "literature of national defense," some openly claimed: "The 'main body of the united front' is not specially arranged and the 'leadership' is not something solely owned by someone. Fighters of various factions should, with the same goal, undertake together leadership responsibilities."(6)

They held: "We should take the united front as an association of people with a common faith and goal ... There is no such question as 'who unifies whom.'" They added: "In the field of literature the situation is the same. The main issue is whether or not all the literary workers have gone to the front of the anti-Japanese struggle for national salvation to struggle in firm unity, but not the question of which faction should be asked to unify others."(7)

A follower of Chou Yang even said: "As a matter of fact, at present the demands of the left writers and that of the masses of people are completely identical. Aside from the demand of resisting the Japanese to save the country, the left writers have no other special demands."(8)

All this is none other than the out-and-out right opportunist line of Wang Ming. Following this capitulationist line, Chou Yang and his ilk made a series of strange remarks. Hsu Mou-yung said that in the united front "Pu Lo (2528 3157)" (namely, the proletariat) should not wear a prominent insignia to distinguish themselves from others and ask for leadership by showing special standing but not their actual work, thereby scaring away the comrades in arms of other strata."

What kind of people will be scared away? An example was cited in an article: "We may as well say that within this united front there are also some people who do not approve the slogan of the national revolutionary war, such as the pro-American and pro-British groups who vigorously advocate fighting the enemy to save the country, but do not oppose national defense."(9)

Some people even clamored that the slogan "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war" should be changed to "literature of the whole nation of the national revolutionary war." (10)

Obviously, these people advocating "National defense literature" even considered the pro-American and pro-British groups as "vigorously advocating fighting the enemy to save the country," and as their "comrades in arms" in "literature of national defense."

The reprimands made by Chou Yang against Lu Hsun were absolutely groundless. The articles written by Lu Hsun during this period show that quite contrary to the case of Chou Yang who pursued Wang Ming's right opportunist line, Lu Hsun recognized and carried out the united front policy of the party from a proletarian standpoint, and wholeheartedly supported the correct line of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's.

In these articles Lu Hsun mentioned Comrade Mao Tse-tung with a mood of boundless respect for him and expressed earnest class feelings toward the party. He said: "I should take those who are shedding their

blood to fight for the survival of the Chinese people as my comrades. I am proud of them."(11)

Writers of different classes can join their efforts in opposing Japan under the banner of resisting Japan, but their ideas cannot exist in peace. Just as Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out: "communists are able to build an anti-imperialist and antifeudal united front with certain idealists or even religious people on the basis of political activities, but they could never agree with their idealism or religious ethics."(12)

At that time Lu Hsun analyzed problems in this way: "I think the unity of literary and art workers on the problems of resisting Japan was unconditional," "But we still can criticize each other on literary problems."

He said: "I think we should say that writers unite under the banner of 'resisting Japan' or under the banner of 'national defense,' but we should not say writers unite under the slogan of 'National defense.'"(13) This indicates that Lu Hsun was aware of the inevitable class struggle in the realm of ideology.

However, Chou Yang persistently said that "national defense literature" was not only the hallmark of writers but also the slogan of literary works. He said: "I just cannot agree if one says that 'National defense literature' is the hallmark of writers, but it must not be regarded as the slogan of literary works. I believe that the slogan 'national defense literature' should be the target in writing literary works. All writers must be called upon to write literature of national defense. A slogan on literature will be meaningless if it has no connection with the activities of writing literature."

He also advocated lowering the standards in writing literary works. He said: "The most important thing is to mobilize everybody to write.... Irrespective of their ideological and technical shortcomings, the writers should be given high appraisal based upon the meaning of the subject matter."

Even ideological "shortcomings" can be disregarded, to say nothing of proletarian stand, of communist ideological leadership, and of the class struggle in the realm of ideology.

To protect his own line of capitulationism, Chou Yang purposely distorted the relations between world outlook and literary works, and denied the decisive role of ideology in writing literary works.

He said: "If in front of us is a talented writer who places emphasis on facts, he will definitely be able to reflect, in his literary works, a certain important aspect of the revolution, irrespective of

what class he belongs to, his personal beliefs, and the degree of his understanding with regard to the true meaning of national revolution. We never overlook the prominent role of a progressive world outlook, but we simply cannot neglect the educational meaning of facts."

Here he urged the proletarian revolutionary writers to give up the purity in the realm of ideology to collude with all kinds of anti-communist ideas.

In talking about the relations between world outlook and literary works, all revisionists always made efforts to slur over the demarcation line between the proletarian ideology and the bourgeois ideology, over the demarcation line between the two opposing classes and two kinds of world outlook, and to deny the dominating role of the writers' stand and world outlook in creating literary works.

Chou Yang's efforts to peddle this kind of fallacy were aimed at opposing proletarian writers who were establishing the world outlook of Marxism-Leninism, and at negating the guiding role of communist ideology so that our literature would divorce itself from the cause of the proletariat and become a tool serving the bourgeoisie.

Chou Yang, who always followed Wang Ming's line of opportunism, had for a long time carried out in the left literary and art movement an organizational line of sectarianism and closed-door-ism. They committed their mistakes of sectarianism and closed-door-ism as they tried to unify and repudiate the proletarian revolutionary writers. The explanation by Chou Yang and others on "National defense literature" and their attack and slanders on the proletarian slogan "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war," particularly their "encirclement and suppression" of communist Lu Hsun, had fully indicated their trend of serious sectarianism and closed-door-ism.

Chou Yang said that if it were not a "literature of national defense" it would be a "literature of traitors," putting a big label of "a literature of traitors" on those who oppose him.

The thieves shouted: "Stop thief!" They attacked Lu Hsun as one who followed "close-door-ism" and "sectarianism." This is shameless slander.

Actually, what Lu Hsun advocated 30 years ago with regard to the struggle against "National defense literature" was not sectarianism at all but the principles of the proletariat. This was a vivid demonstration of the proletarian party character. What Lu Hsun was attacked for was nothing other than the lofty spirit of a proletarian revolutionary. In

fact Chou Yang and others were out-and-out sectarianists, advocating "open-door-ism" to the bourgeoisie and faithfully following their line. On one hand they offered leadership to the bourgeoisie, and on the other hand they denounced the great communist Lu Hsun. They always made strenuous efforts to encircle and attack the revolutionaries who carried out the correct line advanced by Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

Lu Hsun sharply criticized Chou Yang's deep-rooted mistakes of closed-door-ism and sectarianism. Particularly with a correct stand, his article "In Answer to Hsu Mou-yung Concerning the Anti-Japanese United Front" clearly and profoundly condemned and analyzed the sectarian theories of Chou Yang, Hsu Mou-yung, and others. The article pointed out that the article written by Chou Yang was "fundamentally sectarian" that "the federation of literary and art circles that Chou Yang and others occupied was imbued with a sectarian atmosphere," and that "they had a tendency to become writer-tyrants."

The bourgeois line on literature and art in the thirties followed by Chou Yang, the line of revisionism and capitulationism which he followed politically, and the line of sectarianism and closed-door-ism which he advocated organizationally were the products of Wang Ming's line of right opportunism.

3. From class capitulationism to national capitulationism and to the complete bankruptcy of "the literature of national defense."

Class capitulationism spread by Chou Yang and others under the slogan "National defense literature" ran counter to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's thought on the anti-Japanese national united front. The slogan "National defense literature" which countered the proletarian interests had caused serious consequences in the practice of literature and art. At that time a great number of "dramas of national defense," "films of national defense," and many "novels of the whole people" written by Hsia Yen, Tien Han, and others had emerged.

The poison of their works penetrated into each sphere of art and literature. One can also see the evil consequences of such class capitulationism from many "songs of national defense" which were very popular at that time and afterward.

The words of a song in the second act "Escape From Home" in "The Three Periods of a Wandering Life (3177 0072 0005 6752 2575)" reads: "All glory and prosperity are turned into ashes in a second, while boundless happiness immediately becomes something very sad. Do not talk about what is yours or mine, or draw a line between the rich and poor, for we will face the same fate when the enemies come to slaughter and plunder us."

The book "Sai Chin Hua" by Hsia Yen clearly illustrates the true bourgeois nature of the slogan "National defense literature." In hailing Sai Chin Hua -- a traitor and prostitute -- as a national heroine, Hsia Yen not only lost the class stand but also the national class.

This reactionary drama, which was criticized by Lu Hsun and Comrade Ai Ssu-chi at that time was regarded by Chou Yang and his ilk as a masterpiece of "the dramas of national defense." They lauded this drama to the skies by saying that "it has opened up new breeding ground for the dramas with national defense character."

Chou Yang wrote in his work "Literature at the Present Stage" that "the main subjects of history have not yet been discovered. Since the Opium War, there have been many heroic deeds of victory and defeat of the Chinese people and many national heroes have not yet been mentioned.

"All these abundant materials of the past could provide a historical flavor to the major subjects of the literature of national defense. National revolution is not only of significance at the present and in the future, but also in the past.

"We should benefit ourselves by drawing lessons from the repeated appraisal of the past. The continued efforts in this aspect by Hsia Yen, author of 'Sai Chin Hua,' have opened up a new breeding ground for the creation of national defense dramas."

Class capitulationism will inevitably degenerate into national capitulationism. Chou Yang's appraisal of "Sai Chin Hua" provides a good example.

People may ask: How could Chou Yang and some of the writers, who have always considered themselves "leftwing writers," degenerate into captives of the bourgeoisie, clamor for the bourgeois slogan "National Defense literature," and raise a black banner against the party and the people?

In point of fact, there is nothing unusual about this. There are laws governing the spontaneous creation and development of all things in society, and all things have their own historical and class background.

Lu Hsun has pointed out: "Before and after the founding of the 'Union of Leftwing Writers,' some of the so-called revolutionary writers are actually drifting sons of decayed families."

Among the leftwing writers at that time, the overwhelming majority had participated in the revolutionary art and literary movement with the viewpoints of the petit-bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie. Their work outlook was not based on Marxism, while their footing had not shifted

from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. They were actually bourgeois democrats, and some of them even failed to be democratic revolutionaries.

In the 1930's, Chou Yang and his ilk politically adhered to the opportunist line of Wang Ming.

At the very beginning, they firmly adhered to the "left" opportunist line of Wang Ming. Afterward, it was the right opportunist line of Wang Ming which they resolutely carried out.

The slogan "National defense literature" is actually the reflection of Wang Ming's right opportunist line in the leftwing art and literary movement. It is an opportunist line politically; it represents sectarianism organizationally; in the field of art and literary ideology, it represents the ideology of (Pieh-lin--Szu-chi--0446 2651 2448 1015--bracketed names are transliterations) (Tu-po-lo-liu-po-fu--2629 0514 5012 3966 3134 1134), and (Che-erh-ni-hsueh-fu-szu-chi--6508 3643 1441 7185 1133 2448 1015), Russian art and literary commentators of the bourgeoisie; in the dramatic field, it represents the system of (Szu-tan-ni-szu-la-fu-szu-chi--2448 0982 1441 2448 2139 1133 2448 1015). Chou Yang, who has always been a follower of the Russian bourgeois democracy of the 19th century, styled himself "a faithful follower of (Che-erh-ni-hsueh-fu-szu-chi)" as early as the 1930's.

The complete set of bourgeois and revisionist ideology with regard to art and literature represented by Chou Yang precisely illustrates the political viewpoint and philosophical ideology of revisionism in the field of literature and art.

In the later period of the 1930's an important turning point occurred in China's revolution, shifting the civil revolutionary war to the war of resistance against Japan.

The founding of a national united front against Japan was a correct Marxist-Leninist policy to cope with the objective conditions arising from the changes of class contradictions at home and abroad and to push forward the Chinese people's revolutionary movement led by the proletariat.

Proceeding from the stand of right opportunism, Chou Yang and others held the view that, by establishing a united front with the bourgeoisie, it was no longer necessary to draw a line between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and to maintain an independent stand of the proletariat.

They also held that it was imperative to compromise and cooperate with the bourgeoisie in every way, and turn the proletariat and the Communist Party into a tail of the bourgeoisie and its political parties.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung once criticized: "To debate the class stand of the party, to obscure its distinctive features, to sacrifice the interests of the workers and peasants to suit the needs of bourgeois reformism, is sure to lead the revolution to defeat."(14)

In this debate, great communist Lu Hsun firmly adhered to the correct line represented by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and exposed and criticized Chou Yang and other opportunists who practiced class capitulationism.

He pointed out explicitly: "Naturally, it is not wrong to tell everyone of the suffering of being a slave in the hands of a foreign power, with our pens and tongues. But we must be very careful to see that everyone does not draw such a conclusion as this: 'to be a slave of our own people is after all better than to be a slave in the hands of a foreign power.'"(15)

"On Our Literary Movement at the Present Moment," "In answer to Hsu Mou-yung's Question on the United Front Against Japan," and other articles published by Lu Hsun at that time are of great historical significance, having a tremendous influence on the revolutionary art and literary movements at that time and in the future.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung highly evaluated the outstanding contributions to the revolutionary art and literary movement made by Lu Hsun, great communist. He said that "Lu Hsun was the supreme commander in China's cultural revolution; he was not only a great man of letters, but also a great thinker and a great revolutionary.

"Lu Hsun had the most unyielding backbone and was totally free from any trace of obsequiousness and sycophancy; such strength of character is the great treasure among the colonial and semicolonial people.

"Lu Hsun, representing the great majority of the people, was an unprecedented national hero on the cultural front, the most correct, the bravest, the firmest, the most loyal, and the most zealous hero who stormed and broke up the enemy's front. The line he took is precisely the line of the new culture of the Chinese nation."(16)

The argument over the two slogans -- "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war" and "National defense literature" -- in the 1930's was actually the struggle between two classes and two lines, and also the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat for leadership on the art and literary front.

History has already drawn its own conclusion: "During the left-wing art and literary movement in the KMF-controlled areas in the 1930's,

what was represented by Lu Hsun was an art and literary line of the proletariat and what he firmly adhered to was the correct line laid down by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. However, the line of art and literature represented by Chou Yang was a bourgeois line, and what he firmly adhered to was the right opportunist line of Wang Ming. 'Mass literature of the national revolutionary war' was a proletarian slogan. Whereas 'National defense literature' was a bourgeois slogan; the banner of Lu Hsun was a victorious one, while Chou Yang's 'National defense literature' has come to nought."

4. From "literature of national defense" to "culture of the whole people" is a black line of revisionism.

In the rectification campaign in 1942, Chairman Mao led the whole party to wage a resolute struggle against the bourgeois ideologies represented by the Wang Ming line which once flooded our party. After thoroughly criticizing Wang Ming's political line, military line, and organizational line theoretically, he immediately put forward a thoroughgoing theoretical criticism of Wang Ming's cultural line.

Chairman Mao's writings "On New Democracy" and "Talks at the Yen-an Forum of Literature and Art" provide the most complete, comprehensive, and systematic historical summing up of the struggle between two lines on the cultural front; they inherit and develop the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and theory with regard to literature and art, and put forward a most complete, most thoroughgoing, and most correct revolutionary art and literary line of the proletariat for the time in the revolutionary history of the proletariat.

It is well known to the people that much criticism in "On New Democracy" is directly aimed at Chou Yang and his ilk. Furthermore, criticism in "Talks at the Yen-an Forum of Literature and Art" is precisely aimed at Chou Yang and the bourgeois art and literary line of the 1930's represented by him.

Later facts indicated that Chou Yang and his ilk had adopted a double-dealing attitude toward Comrade Mao Tse-tung's criticism of them. They feigned compliance but acted in opposition.

Instead of admitting their errors and willingly abandoning the black line of the 1930's, they secretly conducted a series of insidious activities behind the back of the party Central Committee.

They described themselves as the representatives of the correct line of the proletariat by going all-out to debase Lu Hsun, lavish praise on themselves, distort history, and turn things upside down.

Even today the ghost and spirit of Wang Ming's opportunist line still exists among Chou Yang and his ilk; they openly or secretly oppose the thought of Mao Tse-tung, Chairman Mao's principle with regard to literature and art, the art and literary line laid down by the party, as well as the party Central Committee and Chairman Mao.

As early as January 1940, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said that, following the new cultural movement since the "4 May" movement, "a brand new force of culture has been born in China" under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and "Lu Hsun was the greatest and bravest flag bearer of the new army of culture."

He added that "communist Lu Hsun has become a great man of China's cultural revolution" through the "encirclement and suppression" by the enemies. Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "The orientation of Lu Hsun is the orientation of the Chinese nation's new culture." Comrade Mao Tse-tung's lofty appraisal of Lu Hsun has undoubtedly confirmed the slogan of "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war."

When the sixth volume of the "Complete Works of Lu Hsun" was published 18 years later in 1958, they managed to squeeze their anti-party merchandise into the explanatory note. It was none other than Chou Yang, the promoter of "literature of national defense," who put this note in the "Complete Works of Lu Hsun" to turn facts upside down. The character Chou Chi-ying who was thoroughly refuted by Lu Hsun in his letter "In Answer to Hsu Mou-yung's Question on the United Front Against Japan," is actually Chou Yang himself.

Thirty years ago, Chou Yang and his ilk vilified Lu Hsun as a "left" sectarianist, and now they have used the same old tune to label Lu Hsun as a "sectarianist."

Their despicable activities are aimed at opposing Comrade Mao Tse-tung's historical summing up of the struggle between two lines on the art and literary front, resisting Comrade Mao Tse-tung's criticism on their errors committed in the 1930's, and attacking communist Lu Hsun and the proletarian art and literary line represented by him.

Chou Yang seized every available opportunity to besmirch Lu Hsun. His explanatory note on the "Complete Works of Lu Hsun" is but one instance made public.

Several years ago, when a blast of "go it alone" and "reversing the previous correct decision" wind took place, it was also the time for all monsters, seeing the temporary setbacks of the nation, to come out of their hiding place. Chou Yang once again directed the spearhead of his attack at Lu Hsun, the communist.

On 17 March 1961, Chou Yang, in his conversation with members of the motion picture production team working on "The Life of Lu Hsun," said: "Lu Hsun was not a political careerist after all." "He never threw himself into the vortex of the revolution." "Better stress his activities as an author and his literary activities, treating his revolutionary activities as an inherent and spiritual echo.

"His direct connection should not be emphasized. If he were directly linked with the revolutionary activities, that would, in the first place, be contrary to history, and second, would put Lu Hsun in a passive and awkward position."

It can be seen that Chou Yang has all along been opposing Comrade Mao Tse-tung's views in the appraisal of Lu Hsun.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out as far back as May 1942 that the basic question of literature and art "serving whom" was never answered in the thirties.

"The disputes, differences, opposition, and lack of unity among some comrades in the past had nothing to do with the question of the basic principal; rather, they centered around questions of secondary importance, even not involving the matter of principle. There seemed to have been no difference of opinion between the two contending sides on this point. On the contrary, there was almost a consensus, indicating a tendency in varying degrees to belittle the workers, peasants, and soldiers, and to be divorced from the masses."(17)

At that time, some left writers represented by Lu Hsun raised the slogans about literature and art serving the workers and peasants and about workers and peasants themselves doing creative work in literature and art, but the fundamental problem of literature and art being integrated with workers and peasants was never systematically solved. Among left literary and art workers, the overwhelming majority were bourgeois democratic elements.

"They stand on the side of the petit bourgeoisie. They created their work as a self-expression of the petit bourgeoisie, as can be seen from quite a number of literary works. Most of the time, they were full of sympathy for those intellectuals with a petit bourgeois background, and even the shortcomings of these intellectuals were condoned or even encouraged."(18)

However, 20 years later, on 3 November 1962, Chou Yang said in a discussion group on "the history of modern Chinese literature": "The 'Union of Leftist Writers' has indeed ushered in a new phase for modern literature."

"The modern literature, during its initial period, was limited to only the intellectuals, but later spread to the workers and peasants."

Before then, in 1957, those forming the nucleus of Chou Yang's antiparty group, such as Hsia Yen, Tien Han, Yang Han-sheng, and others, all spoke in one voice that as far back as the thirties they had already "properly led the Chinese literary and art movement"; that they had determined the orientation of literature and art for the workers, peasants, and soldiers, and solved the problem of integration of the literary and art workers and the workers, peasants, and soldiers; and that the organization of drama troupes at that time was already revolutionized.

To solve the fundamental problem of literature and art serving workers, peasants, and soldiers, and the integration of literary and art workers with workers, peasants, and soldiers, the world outlook of the literary and art workers must be reformed.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has time and again pointed out the importance of literary and art workers learning Marxism-Leninism in order to reform their world outlook. He said: "Anyone who calls himself a revolutionary writer of Marxism, especially a communist writer, must know Marxism. Use the viewpoint of dialectical materialism and historical materialism to observe the world, society, and literature and art."(19)

However, Chou Yang deliberately opposed Mao Tse-tung's thought, and has all along distorted the relation between the world outlook and creative work. He also denied the leading role of world outlook in creative work, and ignored the importance of the ideological remolding for literary and art workers.

Those fallacies which he did his best to spread in the thirties continued even after the liberation. In an article published in 1956, he said: "Writers and literary and art workers who are capable and faithful to realities may obtain an advanced world outlook through their own creative work and living practice."(20)

Speaking at a literary and art forum, Chou Yang said on 28 July 1961: "If it is held that without a thoughtful solution of his world outlook regarding the political stand, an author can never produce any good work ... meaning that all problems are problems of the world outlook."

In his talk at a forum on "the outline of literature," he said: "If we attribute everything to the world outlook, our world outlook will become Philistine."

Chou Yang further used "the idea of the image" as a weapon to spread "the theory of specialization of authors," calling it "a special law of literature and art."

With this kind of fallacy he attempted to oppose party leadership, the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, and the use of Mao Tse-tung's thought to reform the world outlook of literary and art workers.

At the sixth plenary session of the sixth Central Committee of the part in 1938, Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out: "The foreign stereotype writing must be abolished, the empty and abstract tune must not be sung too often, and dogmatism must be laid to rest. They must all be replaced by the Chinese working styles and Chinese characteristics that Chinese people like to see and hear."

In the Yen-an forum on literature and art held in 1942, he again pointed out: "Coming from the garrets to the revolutionary base areas, they have passed not only from region to another but also from one historical epoch to another." The epoch is gone and gone forever."(21)

These comments are directly connected with the mistakes of Chou Yang and his kind.

However, Chou Yang, Tien Han, Hsia Yen, and Yang Han-sheng (Note: These four men were bitterly condemned as "the four fellows" by Lu Hsun in his reply to Hsu Mou-yung concerning the question of a united front against Japan), who are representatives of the bourgeoisie worming their way into the party, were unwilling to recognize these realities. They stubbornly struggled, and desperately refused to let go of "the epoch that is gone."

Like those representatives of the exploiting class in history who were overthrown, they were unwilling to withdraw from the political stage. From 1959 to 1962, when in society an antiparty, antisocialist counter-current swelled into a flood, and monsters of all kinds crawled out of their hiding places, they seized the opportunity to whip up a gust of black wind of the thirties.

They advocated that it was necessary to inherit the so-called "lively work style of the thirties" and use it to lead the revolutionary creative work in the contemporary socialist literature and art.

Tien Han, Yang Han-sheng, and others went even further by saying it is necessary to follow their so-called experiences of the thirties to correct our contemporary work.

On 16 September 1957, Chou Yang spoke at an enlarged meeting of the party organization of the writers association, saying: "The history of the leftist cultural movement is a history of the persistent struggle between the two lines. One is the proletarian line, which has developed from its stage of infancy, passing through its period of committing the serious mistakes of being dogmatic and sectarian, to its stage of securing a basis for its theory in 1942 after the publication of the 'Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art.' The other is a revisionist and bourgeois line. Outwardly, this line is pro-Marxist, but, in fact, it is anti-Marxist."

On 28 February 1958, Chou Yang published the above-mentioned speech in PEOPLE'S DAILY under the title "A Great Debate on the Literature and Art Front," but he changed this passage to read: "The struggle between the proletarian line and the bourgeois line in China's literature and art circles has existed for a long time. The proletarian line has passed from its stage of infancy to one of committing all kinds of mistakes of being dogmatic and sectarian and to its final stage of laying a good foundation for its theory in 1942 after Comrade Mao Tse-tung published his 'Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art.' This line has been proved correct through practice."

It goes without saying that Chou Yang regarded himself as the representative of the proletarian line. This was a despicable trick. Chou Yang was trying to mix white with black by linking Mao Tse-tung's thought, which praised Lu Hsun for his good works, to this one fallacy, which completely disapproved of Lu Hsun's works completely, and by mixing Comrade Mao Tse-tung's correct line with Wang Ming's opportunist line.

It is correct to say that the struggle between the two lines in the literature and art circles has been going on persistently and vigorously since the thirties. But who should have pretended to uphold Marxism while opposing Marxism? None other than Chou Yang and the line he represents, a black line, which runs counter to Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" were directed against Wang Ming's opportunist line, which was then represented by Chou Yang. But Chou Yang at that time claimed to be a representative of the proletarian line and turned around to accuse Lu Hsun of being a representative of the revisionist and bourgeois line. Despite this trick he did not succeed.

In 1962, 20 years after Comrade Mao Tse-tung made his "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" and four years after the publication of the "Complete Works of Lu Hsun" and his note on "National defense literature," Chou Yang came out in the open again to revive the slogan "National defense literature."

On 3 November of the same year, Chou Yang made a speech at a forum on the "history of contemporary Chinese literature," saying that both of the two lines were correct and applicable and both had good and bad points, and that because the slogan "National defense literature" was issued first, it was acceptable to the people.

The defect of this slogan was that it failed to represent the principles of the proletariat. As to the other slogan, because it was representative of the "revolution" and the "masses," it sounded frightening to those who supported only the formation of the anti-Japanese front but were still afraid of the revolution and the masses.

Therefore, under the circumstances, the two lines should be coordinated so that they could supplement each other.

At that time Feng Hsueh-feng began to oppose the slogan "National defense literature" on behalf of Lu Hsun and the party Central Committee. So Hu Feng split with Feng Hsueh-feng. Both sides were deeply imbued with sectarian ideas.

From 1936, the year in which the great debate between the two slogans started, to 1958 in which the article "In Answer to Hsu Mou-yung and Concerning the Anti-Japanese United Front" was published, Chou Yang had been persistently opposed to the slogan "Mass literature of the national revolutionary war." But in late 1962 he suddenly changed his tune, saying that "the two slogans should be regarded as equally applicable and correct."

Such a change of tune revealed his more sinister scheme. The change was a variant adapted to the situation at that time, a denial made by a thief to cover up his wrongdoing, and a statement which lacked sincerity.

After liberation, Chou Yang changed his appraisals of the slogan "National defense literature" many times. These changes took place when he saw the changes in the class struggle going on in society. But he had never given up his revisionist black line for literature and art.

In recent years Chou Yang has been raising a clamor for "a culture of the whole people and for literature and art to serve the whole people." At a forum held among the cadres attending the second theatrical festival organized by the People's Liberation Army, he asked: "What is socialist culture? It is culture of the whole people." The same year, in a lecture at Peking University, he repeated: "Our literature and art are that of the whole people." At a Peking forum on literature and art held on 28 July 1961, he said: "The people of the whole country are the object of our service. The object of service has changed since the Yen-an

forum on literature and art. The scope of service now is wider than that of the time of the Yen-an forum." At a national meeting on folklore films on 23 June 1961, he said: "Some films reflect both the interests of a certain class and the interests of the whole people." And "a work of art should be acceptable to any class. Works produced by a certain class must not be intended for the exclusive appreciation of that class. Otherwise, they will be failures."

On 1962, pretending to hold aloft the banner of the "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art," Chou Yang expressed his opposition to these talks. While pretending to hold aloft the red banner of Mao Tse-tung's ideas on literature and art, he opposed these ideas. In his talks and treatises he openly advocated the revisionist line for literature and art to serve "the whole people."

He emphatically pointed out that "the situation in 1962 is quite different from that 20 years ago," that "the people of China have successfully completed our socialist revolution"; therefore, "the whole people, particularly workers, peasants, and soldiers, are the object of literary and art services," meaning that Chairman Mao's "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" were something of the past and that contemporary literature and art should serve the whole people. This was a resurrection of his "literature of national defense" of the 1930's, a variant adapted to present-day conditions; it was a concentrated expression of opposition to Mao Tse-tung's ideas on literature and art.

Throughout the sharp class struggle waged on the literature and art front, Chou Yang has been the "protector" of all monsters and freaks.

Chou Yang and other bourgeois representatives who wormed their way into the party seized and occupied leading positions in the literary and art work of our country and exercised a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the revolutionary literature and art of the proletariat, preparing conditions for a restoration of capitalism in China.

It is very clear that the "culture of the whole people" for which Chou Yang clamored was a successor to the "literature of the whole nation" which he had advocated 30 years ago, and both were products of the same black revisionist line. Now the truth is out: The "supreme master" of the literature and art of the 1930's was none other than Chou Yang.

Tien Han and Hsia Yen dignified themselves with the title of "elders" of the 1930's in dramatic and film circles, respectively. They were energetic trumpeters on questions concerning the "literature and art of the 1930's," but it was Chou Yang who stood behind them and directed their operations.

Chou Yang was indeed the representative of the revisionist black line who carried it forward from the 1930's right into the 1960's.

We must hold high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, we must thoroughly discard all blind reverence for the so-called literature and art of the 1930's, we must thoroughly eliminate the black line that has run through the literary and art front ever since the slogan "National defense literature" was issued, we must thoroughly wipe out all the influence that Chou Yang's revisionist black line exerted on literary and art work, and we must carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end unswervingly.

FOOTNOTES

1. Chou Yang's statements quoted in this article, if not otherwise specified as to their source, are all from "On Literature of National Defense," "Contemporary Culture," and "Discussion With Mr. Mao Tun on the Slogan 'National Defense Literature.'"
2. "The Establishment of a Literature of National Defense" in "The Debate on National Defense Literature," p. 11.
3. "Cultural Questions of the Present Stage" by Jen Pei-ko in the monthly ESSAY, first issue, Vol. II, 1936.
- 4 and 5. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," second edition of 1952, People's Publishing House, Vol. II, pp. 698 and 383.
6. The New Knowledge Association's publication "On the Questions of a United Front in the Literary and Art Circles" in "The Debate on National Defense Literature," p. 590.
7. "On the Two Slogans" by Chang Keng in CULTURAL CIRCLE, third issue, Vol. I, 1936.
8. "On the Debate Over the Literature of National Defense" by Ting Fei in "The Debate on National Defense Literature," p. 515.
9. "Cultural Questions of the Present Stage" by Jen Pei-ko in the monthly ESSAY, first issue, Vol. II, 1936.
10. "Commenting on the Two Slogans" by Mei Yu in "The Debate on National Defense Literature," p. 329.
11. "Complete Works of Lu Hsun," Vol. VI, p. 474.

12. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," Vol. II, p. 700.
13. "Complete Works of Lu Hsun," Vol. VI, p. 433.
14. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," second edition of 1952, People's Publishing House, Vol. I, p. 255.
15. "Complete Works of Lu Hsun," Vol. VI, p. 48.
16. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," Vol. II, p. 691.
17. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," second edition of 1953, People's Publishing House, Vol. III, p. 859.
18. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," Vol. III, p. 858.
19. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," Vol. III, pp. 853 and 875.
20. "The Mission of Creating a Socialist Literature" in LITERARY AND ART JOURNAL, issues five and six, 1956.
21. "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung," Vol. III, p. 877.

CSO: 3530-D

- END -