



**ON THE
COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY
DOUBLE-DEALER CHOU YANG**

Yao Wen-yuan

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**ON THE
COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY
DOUBLE-DEALER CHOU YANG**

Yao Wen-yuan

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1967**

**Quotation from Chairman
Mao Tse-tung**

The imperialists and domestic reactionaries will certainly not take their defeat lying down and they will struggle to the last ditch. After there is peace and order throughout the country, they will still engage in sabotage and create disturbances in various ways and will try every day and every minute to stage a comeback. This is inevitable and beyond all doubt, and under no circumstances must we relax our vigilance.

“Opening Address at the First Plenary Session of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference”

THE great proletarian cultural revolution now in full spate is like a tidal wave flushing out all hidden vipers from their dens.

The former Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party—the “court of the Demon King”—where counter-revolutionary revisionists had been entrenched for a long time, has fallen with a crash!

At the recent Literature and Art Workers' Rally for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, Comrade Chiang Ching pointed out:

The heinous crimes committed by the former Peking Municipal Party Committee, the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee and the former Ministry of Culture when they ganged up against the Party and the people must be exposed and liquidated in a thoroughgoing way. The bourgeois reactionary line within our Party which op-

poses the proletarian revolutionary line of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao must also be exposed and repudiated in a thoroughgoing way.

The exposure and liquidation of Chou Yang's gang in the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee has a direct bearing on the use of Mao Tse-tung's thought to summarize the revolutionary history of the past decades, on the history of the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads during the period of the socialist revolution, on the history of the struggle within the Party between the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao and the bourgeois reactionary line, and on the further uprooting of the bourgeois anti-Party and anti-socialist political black line. This exposure and liquidation must be carried out in a penetrating and thoroughgoing way.

Chou Yang is typical of counter-revolutionary double-dealers. He consistently played double-dealing tricks to disguise his counter-revolutionary political features, tam-

pered with history, but contrived to slip through unscathed, waved "red flags" to oppose the red flag and carried out a variety of criminal activities. His is an excellent negative example which will teach us from now on to recognize counter-revolutionary double-dealers. On November 29, 1965, at the National Conference of Young Activists in Spare-Time Literary Writing, he delivered his last public report entitled "Hold Aloft the Red Banner of Mao Tse-tung's Thought and Be a Literary Fighter Good at Both Manual Labour and Writing". This report was a typical example of waving "red flags" to oppose the red flag.

Faithfully carrying out the orders of the ringleaders of the counter-revolutionary revisionist clique, Chou Yang in this report tried in every way to resist Comrade Mao Tse-tung's directive on criticizing and repudiating representatives of the bourgeoisie. Under the camouflage of Marxist phraseology, he unscrupulously distorted and falsified the class struggle on the cultural front over the previous sixteen years. In this report, which stood the facts of history on

their head, Chou Yang the revisionist posed as one carrying out Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art. Even more outrageous was the despicable way in which he tampered with Comrade Mao Tse-tung's extremely important directive about the proletarian cultural revolution.

In June 1964, Comrade Mao Tse-tung made a penetrating criticism of Chou Yang and the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Circles and its affiliated associations, which Chou Yang controlled. Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out:

In the last 15 years these associations, most of their publications (it is said that a few are good) and by and large the people in them (that is not everybody) have not carried out the policies of the Party. They have acted as high and mighty bureaucrats, have not gone to the workers, peasants and soldiers and have not reflected the socialist revolution and socialist construction. In recent years, they have slid right down to the brink of revisionism. Unless they remould themselves in real earnest, at some future date

they are bound to become groups like the Hungarian Petofi Club.

This was sharp criticism and a heavy blow to the anti-Party and anti-socialist black line in literary and art circles headed by Chou Yang. This directive thoroughly exposed the fact that since the liberation of the whole country the leaders of the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee, including Chou Yang, had been carrying out an anti-Party, anti-socialist revisionist line on literature and art opposed to Mao Tse-tung's thought; that the majority of organizations, groups and publications on the cultural front had all along been controlled by a revisionist clique and become a tool for an overall attack against the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, making a struggle for taking over power imperative; that Chou Yang and the other revisionists in literary and art circles were preparing public opinion for a capitalist restoration and, directed by political careerists of the Khrushchov type, were bound to stage a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat of the Petofi Club type as soon as the time was ripe.

This directive of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's, which was issued to Party organizations at all levels as an official document on July 11, 1964, gave an impetus to the cultural revolution throughout the country. However, in his speech Chou Yang, who had always resisted Comrade Mao Tse-tung's directives, had the effrontery to twist this statement into the following: "He said that the leading members of some important cultural departments and some publications in literature and art had for the most part failed to carry out the policies of the Party, failed to go to the workers, peasants and soldiers and failed to reflect the socialist revolution and construction." Chou Yang deleted Comrade Mao Tse-tung's reference to the long period of "the past 15 years" and reduced Comrade Mao Tse-tung's formulation of "most" cultural departments and their publications to "some" cultural departments and publications in order to cover up the crimes of this anti-Party, anti-socialist black line by every means available. Comrade Mao Tse-tung's exposure of this gang of people as "bureaucrats and overlords", meaning that they were

bourgeois or aristocratic bureaucrats who exercised a dictatorship over the proletariat and working people, was also deleted by Chou Yang. Most outrageous of all was his complete deletion of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's most important statement, an accurate scientific thesis and severe political warning, that these associations under Chou Yang's control "*In recent years, they have slid right down to the brink of revisionism. Unless they remould themselves in real earnest, at some future date they are bound to become groups like the Hungarian Petofi Club.*" Thus "hold aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought" was a camouflage for a huge, nefarious plot to resist Mao Tse-tung's thought by tampering with and distorting it.

However, this directive of Chairman Mao's cannot be expunged by Chou Yang's sinister hand. Let us take Chairman Mao's directive as a guide to analyse the history of class struggle over the past 16 years and use a wealth of hard facts to expose the true features of the counter-revolutionary double-dealer Chou Yang.

THE HISTORY OF A COUNTER- REVOLUTIONARY DOUBLE-DEALER

In his report to the young spare-time writers, Chou Yang, posing as one who had "always been correct", summarized the "five great debates and criticisms" since liberation. He had the effrontery to masquerade as the representative of the "full and correct implementation of Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art".

This was a fraud, a lie, turning black into white. It was an utter falsification of history done in broad daylight.

Let us see where Chou Yang really stood before and after each major struggle on the ideological front.

The first major struggle was the criticism in 1951 of the film *The Life of Wu Hsun*.¹ This struggle took place less than two years

¹ Wu Hsun (1838-96) was a big landlord, usurer and rogue during the Ching Dynasty, but the reactionary film *The Life of Wu Hsun* presents him as a great man who was willing to sacrifice himself to provide the sons of poor peasants with a chance to study.

after the founding of the People's Republic of China. At that time, land reform and the movement to suppress counter-revolutionaries were in full swing. The bourgeoisie and the remnant forces of feudalism, plotting together, launched a fierce onslaught on the young dictatorship of the proletariat. They brought out *The Life of Wu Hsun*, an utterly abominable counter-revolutionary film which eulogized the landlord class and its flunkies, advocated the most shameless servility and capitulationism and defamed the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry. Long before liberation the bogus China Film Company run by the Kuomintang reactionaries had started work on this film; but the guns of the PLA boomed before it was finished. This counter-revolutionary film, left unfinished by the Kuomintang reactionaries, was completed after liberation under the personal supervision of Hsia Yen, another ringleader in Chou Yang's revisionist clique. As soon as it was released, a group of representatives of the bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party immediately beat the drums for the film. They called for learn-

ing from Wu Hsun and the "spirit of Wu Hsun". In other words, they wanted the proletariat to act in the manner of Wu Hsun and, throwing themselves at the feet of the landlord class and bourgeoisie, to capitulate to them. Comrade Mao Tse-tung started himself the criticism of *The Life of Wu Hsun*. In an editorial he wrote for the *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) on May 20 that year entitled "Give Serious Attention to the Discussion of the Film *The Life of Wu Hsun*" he sharply pointed out the error of some "Communist Party members who are reputed to have mastered Marxism" in capitulating to the reactionary ideology of the bourgeoisie. He reprimanded them in these stern words:

Is it not a fact that reactionary bourgeois ideas have found their way into the militant Communist Party? Where on earth is the Marxism which certain Communists claim to have grasped?

Chou Yang was one of the foremost "Communist Party members" Chairman Mao was

referring to. Chou Yang was then vice-director of the Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee and secretary of the leading Party members' group in the Ministry of Culture. He admitted, "I saw *The Life of Wu Hsun* a long time ago." In fact, it was with his approval that the film was shown throughout the country. Its counter-revolutionary nature was immediately recognized by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Once a comrade from the central leadership told Chou Yang that *The Life of Wu Hsun* was a reactionary film advocating bourgeois reformism which must be criticized. Before that comrade could quote Chairman Mao's opinion of it, Chou Yang hit back. He adopted a thoroughly lordly air when he sneered: "Why make such a to-do about a little reformism?"

Only after the publication of the *Renmin Ribao* editorial with Comrade Mao Tse-tung's stern reprimand did Chou Yang feel impelled to make a brief, insincere self-criticism. In fact, he gave the appearance of compliance but secretly acted in defiance, seeking an opportunity to counter-attack. On June 4,

1951, just after the start of the criticism of *The Life of Wu Hsun*, Chou Yang told one of his henchmen Yu Ling in a sinister letter, "On the question of ideological struggle . . . we must use caution and care in handling specific problems. Crude methods and impatience won't do." He also said with evident misgiving, "What we most need to know is the *real situation*." Yu Ling, who had wormed his way into the position of assistant director of the Shanghai Cultural Bureau, protected and conspired with a motley crew of ghosts and monsters. By "caution and care" Chou Yang meant that Yu Ling must be careful to protect the bourgeois forces, protect those counter-revolutionary elements who wore the cloak of literature and art. "Crude methods and impatience won't do" meant that the counter-revolutionary revisionists in cultural circles must make every effort to water down the sharp political content of Chairman Mao's criticism and use delaying tactics to transform a serious class struggle into a question of "understanding". The words the "real situation" were underlined because Chou Yang wanted to carry

on anti-Party activities by collecting materials of various kinds on how to protect bourgeois Rightists. This was a big anti-Party plot on the part of Chou Yang's gang during the criticism of *The Life of Wu Hsun*.

After breaking through Chou Yang's lines of resistance, a fact-finding team, initiated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, was organized to investigate the life history of Wu Hsun. This team overcame the delaying tactics and sabotage of Chung Tien-fei, Chou Yang's secretary whom he sent to the team, and carried on its work by relying on the broad masses. The results of its investigations were published between July 23 and July 28 in the *Renmin Ribao* as "An Account of the Investigation into the Life of Wu Hsun". This article, checked by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, assembled iron-clad facts revealing the reactionary nature of Wu Hsun, a big landlord, usurer and rogue, facts that provide the best summary of this great debate. Faced with irrefutable proof which made further resistance impossible, Chou Yang promptly changed his tactics and did a volte-face in

order to make capital for himself. In an article published in August, after stating casually, "I was unable to fully recognize and point out the film's serious reactionary political character in good time," he suddenly changed his tone and came out with a "systematic" summing up, as if the leader of this great struggle were none other than Chou Yang himself!

It goes without saying that Chou Yang never resigned himself to the criticism by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. No sooner had the high tide of criticism begun to ebb than he used the Second Conference of All-China Literary and Art Workers as a platform from which to launch a counter-attack by "remedying the excesses" in the criticism of *The Life of Wu Hsun*. In a report entitled "Struggle to Create More Good Works of Literature and Art", he fulminated: "Since the criticism of the film *The Life of Wu Hsun* . . . some wrong tendencies have appeared in our work of criticism . . . which should be set right." He then made a wild attack on some allegedly "crude and arbitrary criticism which proceeded from dogmatic

formulas". He said: "The extremist views of part of the audience [*i.e.* the revolutionary criticism of the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers], plus the failure of the Party leadership to 'support' 'creative work', have upset many writers and made them feel depressed. A way must be found to improve their morale."

Please observe how thoroughly Chou Yang "remedied excesses"! In fact he completely negated the criticism of the reactionary film *The Life of Wu Hsun* initiated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, summarily dismissed the criticisms by the workers, peasants and soldiers, and denied Comrade Mao Tse-tung's criticism of him and his like as "Communist Party members who are reputed to have mastered Marxism". The moment the proletariat started to criticize the bourgeoisie, Chou Yang made this great clamour about persons being "upset" and "depressed". How sensitively this representative of the bourgeoisie reflected the demands of his class!

Please observe what role Chou Yang played before and after the criticism of *The Life of Wu Hsun*! At the outset, in the role of the

"grand old man" of literary and art circles, he led his band in spreading poison, violently opposing Mao Tse-tung's thought and the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, and resisting his instructions. The moment the battle began, he hastened to make a sham self-criticism and slipped through by hoodwinking the Party and the people. Then, assuming the posture of being "correct", he set out to "sum up" the struggle and credit himself with its achievements. Later, step by step, he diverted the movement to the right and in revenge launched a counter-attack on revolutionaries. Please note, comrades, that Chou Yang is a master at counter-revolutionary double-dealing tricks. If this point is grasped, the basic features of Chou Yang in each of the struggles become clear and the characteristics of the other "double-faced people" who have already been exposed or are yet to be exposed can also be clearly seen.

The second major struggle was the criticism in 1954 of Yu Ping-po's *Studies of "The*

*Dream of the Red Chamber"*¹ and Hu Shih's **reactionary ideology**. That struggle took place at an important juncture when the socialist transformation in China was developing in depth. After the Party put forward its general line for socialist industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce, the bourgeoisie, not reconciled to its doom, stepped up its attacks on the socialist forces and searched more energetically for agents for itself within the Communist Party. At the Fourth Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Party, the plot of the Kao Kang — Jao Shu-shih anti-Party alliance to usurp Party leadership was

¹ *Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"* is a book written by Yu Ping-po, a bourgeois academic "authority", in which the author evaluates the classical Chinese novel *The Dream of the Red Chamber* from a bourgeois idealist approach and using the method of scholastic textual research. In September 1954 a nationwide movement was launched to criticize Yu's book. This was a struggle between proletarian and bourgeois ideology and against bourgeois idealism.

thoroughly exposed and crushed. Following Stalin's death, the adverse trend of modern revisionism began to run wild. This situation had a direct effect on literary and art circles in China, as a result of which certain bourgeois elements within and outside the Party became active. Making use of the journals and newspapers under their control, the revisionist clique in literary and art circles headed by Chou Yang praised the bourgeois "authorities" to the skies and supported them; on the other hand, they acted like overlords and resorted to suppression and attacks in dealing with the new emerging Marxist forces. They gave all-out support for the extremely reactionary idealism of Hu Shih's school while mercilessly suppressing anyone who rose to criticize the bourgeoisie, thus serving its resistance to socialist transformation. In view of the grave situation created by this black line's dictatorship over literary and art circles, Comrade Mao Tse-tung initiated the criticism of *Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"* and of Hu Shih's reactionary ideology.

In his letter of October 16, 1954 to the members of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee and other comrades concerned, Comrade Mao Tse-tung sharply and penetratingly criticized "certain people" who, considering themselves "big shots", suppressed criticism of the bourgeoisie. He said indignantly:

The whole thing has been set going by two "nobodies", while the "big shots" usually ignore or even obstruct it, and they form a united front with bourgeois writers on the basis of idealism and are willing captives of the bourgeoisie. It was almost the same when the films *Inside Story of the Ching Court*¹ and *The Life of Wu Hsun*

¹ *Inside Story of the Ching Court* is a thoroughly traitorous film shown in Peking in March 1950. In the first instance, the film shamelessly advocates the slave mentality of bending the knee to foreign imperialism. It glamorizes the Emperor Kuang Hsu and the royalists among the landlord class and clamours for "helping the emperor restore the throne and regenerate the imperial regime" by relying on the foreign invasion of China.

were shown. The film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which has been described by certain people as patriotic but is in fact a film of national betrayal, has not been criticized and repudiated at any time since it was shown all over the country. Although *The Life of Wu Hsun* has been criticized, up to now no lessons have been drawn; what is more, we have the strange situation in which Yu Ping-po's idealism

Furthermore, it viciously slanders the heroic Yi Ho Tuan fighting imperialism as "Boxer bandits" who "committed murder and arson" and who "looked as mad as demons". The film goes to extreme lengths to paint a black picture of them. Ranging itself against Comrade Mao Tse-tung's great call "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle", the film speaks with the same voice as the U.S. imperialists and fully meets their needs in their aggression against China and also the needs of their lackeys to stage a counter-revolutionary comeback. But because the top Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road extolled it, this traitorous film was not criticized after its showing, but was actually lauded as a "patriotic" film. Those who oppose the thought of Mao Tse-tung and carry out the bourgeois reactionary line have done their utmost to

is tolerated and lively critical essays by "nobodies" are obstructed. This deserves our attention.

Chou Yang headed the list of the "certain persons" whom Chairman Mao criticized sharply for considering themselves as big shots and suppressing "nobodies" and opposing reprinting articles in the *Renmin Ribao* in criticism of Yu Ping-po. This list also included the *Wenyi Bao* (*Literary Gazette*)

obstruct criticism of the film. It is perfectly clear that what they actually "love" are the landlords and the bourgeoisie, they examine matters from the standpoint of the idealist conception of history as the landlords and the bourgeoisie do. They are "royalists" in the true sense of the word. Among the "big shots" who applauded *Inside Story of the Ching Court* are those who put forward the bourgeois reactionary line in the present great proletarian cultural revolution. Their reactionary bourgeois world outlook showing itself in their opposition to the thought of Mao Tse-tung, and their true nature which urges them to protect the exploiting classes and hate the revolutionary mass movements, was revealed even in the early days of the People's Republic when they sang the praises of *Inside Story of the Ching Court*.

controlled by Ting Ling and Feng Hsueh-feng.

It was Chou Yang who always pursued the reactionary line of lauding the bourgeois "authorities" and repressing the new emerging Marxist forces. On June 30, 1949, he published an article in the *Wenhui Bao* entitled "On the Question of Intellectuals" in which he hailed bourgeois intellectuals as "one of the leading forces of the revolution", without whom "the revolution cannot succeed". He claimed that the cadres of worker and peasant origin who had now entered the cities were ignorant and "their deficiency in this respect must be made good by the intellectuals in the cities". Time and again he loudly advocated "relying on writers' and artists' own organizations" and using what he called "social methods to lead artistic creation". (*Wenyi Bao* 1953, No. 19.) He forbade the proletariat to interfere with the "organizations" under the control of bourgeois "authorities". This was how Chou Yang "made good the deficiency" in the cultural departments by using bourgeois "authorities", renegades and counter-revolu-

tionaries as the "leading force" and suppressed any criticism of them by revolutionaries.

It was Chou Yang who on the eve of the criticism of *Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"* in 1954, in his article "Develop the Revolutionary Fighting Tradition of May Fourth Literature" still prostrated himself before bourgeois intellectuals, praising their "democratic tendencies", "powers of thinking and ability" and "aspirations and ideals", claiming that they were "men of integrity with a good conscience. . . ." Didn't he laud China's bourgeois intellectuals to the skies?

It was Chou Yang who in the same article extolled "the advanced science and advanced culture and ideology of the West". The "West" here meant the bourgeois culture of Europe and America and every variety of reactionary bourgeois idealist and metaphysical world outlook, of which the most influential was the idealism of the Hu Shih school, namely, bourgeois pragmatism. Didn't this glorification of reactionary bourgeois philosophy of course constitute the greatest

support for bourgeois "authorities" like Yu Ping-po? Didn't this reveal Chou Yang a willing spokesman for the bourgeoisie?

It was Chou Yang who once more played the part of a counter-revolutionary double-dealer in this great struggle. From the very start he did his utmost to turn this sharp political and ideological struggle into a "pure" academic discussion. At a meeting of the classical literature section of the Union of Chinese Writers on October 24, 1954, he eagerly urged everyone to study "questions of academic thinking" which "were extremely complex" and produced a long list of topics for scholastic research. But when the *Renmin Ribao* on October 28 following Comrade Mao Tse-tung's instructions, published an article challenging the editors of *Wenyi Bao* and exposed the bourgeois, aristocratic attitude of certain leading members in literary and art circles, Chou Yang sensed danger in the air and hastily concocted a sham self-criticism. On December 8, 1954, at an enlarged meeting of the presidium of the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Circles and the presidium of the Union

of Chinese Writers, he declared: "Neglecting to criticize and struggle against bourgeois idealism . . . has been the biggest mistake in our work, and I myself have been guilty of this mistake." This "self-criticism", when read between the lines, was simply "everybody has a share in the mistake". Chou Yang had not the least intention of thoroughly criticizing his reactionary bourgeois political stand. What he wanted was to slip through unscathed. By saying "we . . . have further developed the criticism of Hu Shih's bourgeois idealist outlook", he tried to claim as his own the credit due to others. This is shameless! It is clear to all that Chou Yang was not among those who developed this criticism. When he spoke of a "comprehensive criticism" he was up to his old trick of a volte-face. His aim was to keep the leading position he had usurped in order to divert the struggle to the right and launch a counter-attack. In 1961 and 1962 his gang published millions of words of so-called research into the date of Tsao Hsueh-chin's death, his ancestry and the location of the Grand View Garden, as well as numerous

extraordinary maps, in an attempt to re-establish Hu Shih's idealist school.

The third major struggle took place in 1954 and 1955 against the Hu Feng counter-revolutionary clique,¹ following on the heels of the criticism of Hu Shih. This was an acute struggle waged under the direct leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and aimed at wiping out hidden counter-revolutionaries. It was a heavy blow for the counter-revolutionary forces. Chou Yang's ideology was in essence the same as Hu Feng's. Like Hu Feng, he kept preaching

¹Hu Feng was a renegade who sneaked into the ranks of the revolution. After liberation he ganged up with some others from literary and art circles to carry out counter-revolutionary activities. In 1954 he presented a 300,000-word "suggestion" to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, viciously attacking the Party's policy and Mao Tse-tung's teachings on literature and art. In May and June 1955, *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) published three collections of material on the Hu Feng counter-revolutionary clique, thoroughly exposing and smashing its plot to sabotage the revolution.

that "the highest principle of art is truthfulness" (1952) and was opposed to the Marxist world outlook and to Mao Tse-tung's thought. Like Hu Feng, he was opposed to the orientation of literature and art serving the workers, peasants and soldiers, and to writers closely joining in the struggles of the workers, peasants and soldiers, going as far as to state, "They can still merge with the masses without joining in their struggles," and "a division of labour is needed between ourselves and the workers and peasants" (1949), blatantly posing as a lordly aristocrat. Like Hu Feng, he was opposed to writing on important themes and to literature and art serving proletarian politics, actively advocating "complete freedom" in "the choice of subject" and "guaranteeing this freedom to the greatest extent" (1953). Like Hu Feng, he advocated bourgeois humanitarianism and the theory of human nature and opposed class analysis, referring in terms of the theory of human nature to "the process of development of a new national character" (1949) to distort the class features and class character of the

working people. Like Hu Feng, he argued that "writing is the process of an author's coming to grips with life", "the complete synthesis of the objective and the subjective", "the fusion of self with the outer world" (1941), supporting the most reactionary subjective and idealist approach to writing. Like Hu Feng, he considered Western bourgeois literature and art as the pinnacle of culture, never to be surpassed. In fact, he had all Hu Feng's reactionary views on literature and art, only he camouflaged them more cunningly. In 1952, Chou Yang, Lin Mo-han and others called a forum to "criticize" Hu Feng, at which they praised Hu Feng as "supporting Comrade Mao Tse-tung in his political attitude" and "standing with the Party" "in major political orientation and political struggles". They even went so far as to laud this counter-revolutionary ringleader as "a non-Party Bolshevik". This reveals beyond doubt that Chou Yang and company had the same "political orientation" as Hu Feng. The attack on Chou Yang and his gang by Hu Feng's counter-revolutionary clique was

not—and could not be—an attack on these views of theirs. It was pointed out by the *Renmin Ribao* in an editorial note to "The Third Set of Material on the Hu Feng Counter-Revolutionary Clique": "The counter-revolutionaries' attack on a handful of people was only a pretext to hide their real target." The target of their attack was the Communist Party and Mao Tse-tung's thought. Chou Yang, however, took advantage of this opportunity. He seized upon Hu Feng's specious attack on him to pass himself off as the representative of Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art. After that he began to give himself lordly airs and more blatantly wave "red flags" to oppose the red flag. In fact, however, this was political opportunism and an enormous fraud.

But a fox cannot hide its tail. Hardly had the revolutionary powder-smoke of the criticism of Hu Shih and Hu Feng dispersed when Chou Yang hastily diverted to the right the criticism of the bourgeoisie and the struggle against it. In November 1955 he wrote an essay entitled "A Tribute to *Leaves*

of *Grass* and *Don Quixote*", when Comrade Mao Tse-tung's report "On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation" had been published resolutely criticizing Right opportunism, and China's rural areas were experiencing a great socialist upsurge. Comrade Mao Tse-tung called on literary and art workers to go to the countryside to take part in the fiery struggles of the masses and to write in volume about "thousands and tens of thousands" of heroes. Chou Yang, doing the opposite, chose that moment to advocate fervently the "lofty ethical principles" of *Don Quixote*, that is, bourgeois ethical principles. He gave even more fulsome praise to the 19th century American bourgeois poet Walt Whitman, urging writers to emulate Whitman's "example" of "taking part in struggles". He brought out a "new sort of man" from Whitman's work and held him up as a "glorious model" for the Chinese people.

Whitman's remarkable achievement in his poetry is the creation of a splendid image of "man". After reading his poems we seem to see this Whitman-type man, a new sort of man,

strong, big-hearted, with lofty aspirations, creative labouring hands, and eternal optimism.

It can be categorically stated that Whitman's type of man was a new sort of man, one well worth our studying and a fine example on which to model ourselves.

Here Chou Yang's talk about "creative labouring hands" might delude people into thinking that Whitman wrote about the working people. Not so. The "man" sung in *Leaves of Grass* was neither an abstract figure, nor the working people, but the personification of the American bourgeoisie. If we look back we find that in November 1941, in an article published in the *Jiefang Ribao* (*Liberation Daily*) in Yenan, Chou Yang had already lauded the American bourgeoisie. At that time he declared outright that the Whitman-type man whom he admired and praised was "typical of the thoroughly self-confident American bourgeoisie, physically fit and broad-minded". It is enough to make one's flesh creep, the utterly shameless way in which Chou Yang extolled the narrow-mindedness of bourgeois individualism as "broad-minded". At a time

when 600 million workers and peasants were promoting the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce to an upsurge, when socialist heroes were appearing in their thousands and tens of thousands, Chou Yang once again extolled the sham, reactionary, bourgeois "democracy and freedom" as "lofty aspirations", held Whitman up as an "example" of "taking part in struggles", and called the man "typical of the American bourgeoisie" a "new sort of man", "a fine example". He also lauded Don Quixote's chivalric moral standards as "lofty ethical principles" which should be "studied and copied". Was this not open opposition to Mao Tse-tung's thought? Was this not a fierce counter-attack on the world-shaking socialist revolution of the 600 million workers and peasants? Was this not encouragement to the bourgeoisie in towns and villages and Right opportunists within the Party to be "eternally optimistic" and firmly to resist socialist transformation and persist in taking the capitalist road?

But this was not enough. In March 1956, immediately after this praise of the Western bourgeoisie, Chou Yang, in a report called "The Task of Building a Socialist Literature", took the extraordinary step of conferring on five writers the title of "contemporary masters of the art of language". By crowning these "masters" he showed himself a loyal agent for bourgeois "authorities". This, again, was something he had learned from abroad. This was an order for the proletariat to prostrate itself before bourgeois "authorities", a wild counter-attack on Comrade Mao Tse-tung's many instructions. By conferring this title, Chou Yang silenced many people. In 1958 and 1959, when some revolutionary "nobodies" disregarded Chou Yang's orders at the risk of a trouncing and made a slight criticism of some of these "masters", Chou Yang at once rushed to their defence, attacking their critics time and again in the most abusive terms. In February 1962, in a speech to "veteran dramatists" he fulminated: "Some people resent the fact that certain writers have been called masters of language, and claim this is puffing them

up. . . . Do we have to study language or not? Should we learn from masters or not?" This was an attempt to force young people to fawn like slaves upon the bourgeois "masters". This despot forbade voicing the least "resentment" against the bourgeoisie.

The fourth major struggle was the great battle in 1957 to smash the frenzied attack of the bourgeois Rightists. This struggle took place after the socialist transformation of ownership on China's economic front had been in the main completed. The development of the adverse revisionist current in China was directly stimulated by international revisionism, which came out into the open and grew rampant after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. At that time Chou Yang published a series of speeches and articles providing spiritual weapons for the ruthless attacks by the bourgeois Rightists.

In March 1956, just after the 20th Congress, Chou Yang stated explicitly at a forum on literary and art work:

It is essential to learn from capitalist countries. We must learn not only from the

Soviet Union but also from the progressive art of capitalist countries. . . . *Madame Curie*, for instance, is an excellent film which reaches a high standard both ideologically and artistically. Although this American film made over a dozen years ago does not propagate communism outright, it has the communist world outlook. *Madame Curie's* world outlook is in accord with that of us Communists. So we must establish a closer relationship with the progressive literature and art of capitalist countries. . . . We should absorb what is good in them; in the process of doing so, we can exert an influence on each other.

This was a blueprint for "peaceful evolution". *Madame Curie* was a reactionary film made at the time when Roosevelt was in power. It used the story of *Madame Curie's* life to advocate such reactionary views as bourgeois humanism, pacifism, individual struggle, the pursuit of personal fame and class conciliation. It preached that scientific research transcended classes and politics and served the "whole of mankind". Thus the aim of this film, in fact, was to help the monopoly capitalists extract the maximum profits. This "biographical film" was a relatively subtle attempt by the U.S. monopolists

to glamorize the bourgeoisie in order to "influence" and corrupt the working people of America, to make them leave the path of class struggle and dream of climbing to the upper stratum of capitalist society. Its aim was thoroughly vicious. And this film had much greater power to deceive than the usual run of sexy films or "Westerns". Chou Yang made much of this film and praised it as "progressive art" in order to do what U.S. imperialism wanted to do but could not — to "influence us" with the bourgeois reactionary art of the West, to change our art into revisionist art peddling cheap bourgeois rubbish under the signboard of socialism, to help bring up new capitalist elements. We have only to look at all the pernicious films produced during recent years under the direction of Chou Yang and his gang to see what a close relationship these bad films have with Western bourgeois art, and to understand the effect of studying such "progressive" American films.

Chou Yang said: "Madame Curie's world outlook was in accord with that of us Communists." A great discovery! When you

admit that your world outlook is "in accord" with that of the bourgeoisie, you betray the fact that the "communism" professed by you "Communists" is a sham, is really revisionism. Here you let the cat out of the bag. The same is true of those in authority in the field of natural science who are taking the capitalist road. Just as in the case of Chou Yang, in every respect their reactionary world outlook is "in accord" with that of the bourgeoisie.

Shortly afterwards, on September 26, 1956, Chou Yang published an article in the *Renmin Ribao* called "May Literature and Art Play a Tremendous Role in the Great Cause of Building Socialism". This was an anti-socialist, bourgeois reactionary programme. It was a manifesto against the Party and Mao Tse-tung's thought.

In this article Chou Yang went all out to oppose "vulgarization", "over-simplification", "taboos and commandments" and the "function of propaganda", saying that the Party's "dogmatism", "sectarianism" and "over-simplified and crude attitude in dealing with literary and art work" had "serious-

ly restricted the freedom of writers and artists in creative work". Freedom has a class content. Abstract "freedom in creative work" is an anti-Party slogan of the bourgeoisie. In class society there is only class freedom, no freedom transcending classes. If the proletariat and working people are free to exercise dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, then the bourgeoisie and all reactionaries are not free to carry out counter-revolutionary activities. If the bourgeoisie is free to oppose the Party and oppose socialism, then the proletariat and working people are not free to carry out the socialist revolution and socialist construction. Chou Yang's demand for "freedom in creative work" from the Party is to win freedom for the bourgeoisie to oppose the Party and socialism and to free monsters and demons from "restrictions" so that they could freely carry out counter-revolutionary activities against Mao Tse-tung's thought and socialism. The "dogmatism" and "taboos and commandments" attacked by Chou Yang were the fundamental principles on proletarian literature and art which Com-

rade Mao Tse-tung expounded in the "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art". His attack on the "function of propaganda" was directed against literature and art publicizing the proletariat, that is, the communist, world outlook. The two anti-Party slogans "freedom in creative work" and "anti-dogmatism" later became the chief weapons of violent attack of bourgeois Rightists in literary and art circles. Right up to 1962 and 1963, there were still people harping on this hackneyed theme of "respect freedom in creative work" to encourage the growth of all kinds of poisonous weeds.

The wilder the bourgeois attack on the proletariat, the more clearly Chou Yang's true counter-revolutionary features were exposed. On April 9, 1957, when the savage attacks of bourgeois Rightists on the proletariat reached a climax, Chou Yang published a speech in *Wenhui Bao* in which he exultantly proclaimed, "Freer choice of subject-matter for dramatists is a great event in our theatre." This was to support the troop of monsters rampaging on the stage. He heaped praise on the poisonous weeds

“critical of life”—an expression borrowed by the Rightist Liu Pin-yen and others from the Soviet revisionists—claiming that “works which sharply expose and criticize the negative phenomena in life are attracting more and more attention”. That month, Chou Yang convened a series of meetings to fan the flames and foment trouble, to oppose “rigour” and demand a “thaw”, to incite the Rightists to hasten the coming of “spring”, namely, the restoration of capitalism. In a report made on May 13, he wildly slandered Party members as “spies” and “blocks of wood”, praising the “courage” of *Wenhui Bao* which had become the mouthpiece of the Chang Po-chun—Lo Lung-chi alliance. He said that those who spoke of killing several million Communists were “not necessarily counter-revolutionaries”. Here he really bared his poison fangs! This is conclusive proof that he was a big Rightist who had escaped undetected.

But as soon as the anti-Rightist struggle started, this wily counter-revolutionary double-dealer trimmed his sails to the wind and by a sudden metamorphosis concealed

his features as a big Rightist. At the start of the rectification movement Chou Yang and those in leading positions in the former Propaganda Department of the Central Committee had tried most energetically to reverse the decision on the anti-Party clique of Ting Ling and Chen Chi-hsia; they urged that its anti-Party label be removed, and directed the spearhead of their attack against the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao. But when the anti-Rightist struggle started, this big Rightist Chou Yang at once made use of the repudiation of Ting Ling, Chen Chi-hsia and Feng Hsueh-feng to masquerade as Left; and posing as one who had been “correct all along”, he summed up the struggle in literary and art circles. In the article “A Great Debate on the Literary and Art Front” he divided writers and artists into “two kinds of people”, one kind “not of one heart with the Party” and “unwilling to remould themselves in line with the collective spirit”, while the other kind, supposed to include Chou Yang, had “already discarded individualism” and were “of one heart with the Party”.

How despicable these double-faced tactics appear when we look at Chou Yang's vicious Rightist statements! Using his double-dealing tactics, Chou Yang had taken advantage of the struggle against the counter-revolutionary Hu Feng clique; now he did the same in this struggle against the anti-Party clique of Ting Ling, Chen Chi-hsia and Feng Hsueh-feng. He availed himself of both struggles to cover up his own crimes, to shield a group of Rightists and traitors so that they could avoid detection by the masses, and to place a gang of adherents to his black line in a variety of leading posts in literary and art circles in order to expand his anti-Party, anti-socialist forces. In addition, he took this opportunity to whitewash himself. He tampered with the history of the 1930's when he carried out Wang Ming's Right opportunist line, proposed the capitulationist slogan "a literature of national defence" and slandered Lu Hsun as "sectarian". What a master of trickery!

There are certain people who like to write trilogies. In a broad sense, Chou Yang played a three-part intrigue: frenzied attacks

on the Party and Mao Tse-tung's thought; then a prompt but sham self-criticism or assumed enthusiasm to show that he was taking the correct side; then a large-scale counter-attack in revenge, and new attacks. Chou Yang's history of being "*correct all along*" is a history of counter-revolutionary double-dealing. But the laws of class struggle operate independent of man's will. Chou Yang slipped through four major struggles. In the fifth major struggle, before he could complete his three-part intrigue his counter-revolutionary revisionist features have been completely exposed by the sharp sword of the great proletarian cultural revolution.

COMPLETE EXPOSURE IN GREAT STORM

Since the general line for socialist construction was put forward in 1958, China's socialist revolution has developed in depth. During this period, the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party headed by Comrade Mao

Tse-tung has carried out two major struggles against the counter-revolutionary revisionist clique and the bourgeois reactionary line within the Party, the one in 1959 and the other at present. In these struggles, China's socialist cause has gained unprecedentedly great victories.

In the great storms of the present class struggle, the former leading members of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the Ministry of Culture and the Peking Municipal Committee of the Party, including Chou Yang, revealed their counter-revolutionary revisionist features more fully. Chou Yang decided that he could now act more boldly, in the belief that his power and political capital had increased, and because he had the Khrushchov-type careerist in the former Peking Municipal Committee behind him as well as those who had put forward the bourgeois reactionary line. He dropped his mask and revealed his true counter-revolutionary colours, making more vicious, unrestrained and clamorous attacks on the Party, the dic-

tatorship of the proletariat and Mao Tse-tung's thought.

In January 1959, the Khrushchov revisionist clique convened the 21st Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. At that congress, Khrushchov viciously slandered and attacked China's general line, the people's communes and the great leap forward. Supported by the Khrushchov modern revisionist clique, the Right opportunist anti-Party clique which looked upon itself as a new Hai Jui put forward an out-and-out revisionist programme at the Lushan Meeting in the hope of overthrowing the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and dragging China back on to the dark road of capitalism. In the course of this, Chou Yang frantically carried out intensive counter-revolutionary activities and actively served the political needs of the Right opportunist anti-Party clique.

In February 1959, *Mudan* No. 2 published Chou Yang's "Talks at the Loyang Forum of Propaganda and Educational Workers" which declared that the criticisms made in 1958 had resulted in "a sense of suppression"

and this must be overcome so that "everybody dares speak out and express different views". "Everybody" must belong to a class. To which class did "everybody" whom Chou Yang was trying to mobilize belong? He had in mind a handful of bourgeois Rightists. Either the proletariat suppresses the bourgeoisie, and socialism suppresses capitalism, or the other way round. If the proletariat and broad revolutionary masses are not "suppressed" by the bourgeoisie, they are bound to "suppress" the bourgeoisie; for as long as opposed classes exist there is no society with equality for "everybody", in which "everybody" suffers no "suppression". The dictatorship of the proletariat implements the fullest democracy for the broad masses of the revolutionary people, but must exercise firm dictatorship over the handful of landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists. Exercising dictatorship over the enemy is the only way to guarantee the people's democratic rights. Chou Yang urged that "everybody" should dare "speak out" because he wanted those monsters who had been re-

judiated to rise up again. He would allow them to "speak out" to attack Mao Tse-tung's thought and the Party's general line, but he would not allow the proletariat to "speak out" condemning them. He said, "The minority must also be allowed to speak out, because it represents certain social forces." This was turning black into white. A class analysis must be made both of the "majority" and the "minority". Staunch Left and stubborn Rightists are both in the minority. But whereas the Rightists are a very small minority, the Left can become the majority by winning over and uniting with the people in the middle. Chou Yang savagely opposed the proletarian Left "minority" while helping the smaller "minority" of bourgeois Rightists in their attempt to seize power. He clearly wanted the latter to exercise dictatorship over the revolutionary people.

In the early spring of 1959, to carry out his reactionary programme for inciting monsters and demons to "speak out", Chou Yang proposed to Chou Hsin-fang that he

put on the opera *Hai Jui Appeals to the Emperor*,¹ providing him with specific material. He told Chou Hsin-fang: Nowadays "we must put on operas of this kind because everyone is afraid to speak out". In this secret discussion between these two anti-Party elements, "a minority" had become "everyone". But "everyone" here meant the very small number of landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists whom they represented. Chou Yang wanted *Hai Jui Appeals to the Emperor* to embolden the Right opportunists and all monsters and demons. In 1959 he advocated "Hai Jui's spirit" far and wide, urging the cadres and actors of the provincial companies who came to Peking

¹Hai Jui (1514-87) was a Ming Dynasty official. With a view to consolidating the dictatorship of the feudal landlord class over the peasantry so that their interests could be safeguarded, he wrote a memorial on "Maintaining Order" to the Emperor Shih Tsung, criticizing the emperor's superstitious belief in Taoism and his negligence in affairs of state. He was sent to prison for his offence.

to "choose Hai Jui and Pao Kung"¹ as the chief characters for "operas on historical themes to be written today". Did not Wu Han state that writing anti-Party operas on Hai Jui should be done in "a planned way throughout the whole country"? It was Chou Yang who directed this "plan".

At the forum on creative work in literature and art in February 1959, Chou Yang wildly attacked the great leap forward and paid fulsome praise to the "international standard" set by the reactionary art of modern revisionism. He lashed out at our Party: "After producing ten million tons of steel, they think themselves so wonderful that they even look down on the Soviet Union." It was China's 700 million great people who kept in mind the revolutionary

¹Pao Kung, whose real name was Pao Cheng (999-1062), was an official of the Northern Sung Dynasty. The feudal ruling class glorified him as an "honest" official in order to deceive the people, conceal class contradictions, obliterate class distinction and thus weaken the will to fight of the oppressed and exploited classes. In reality, he was an out-and-out loyal apologist for the feudal ruling class.

storms of the five continents and their class brothers throughout the world that they dared look down on all reactionaries, including the U.S. imperialists and modern revisionists, dared wage a tit-for-tat struggle against all monsters, dared scorn, outdo and defeat them. Since Chou Yang had eyes for nothing but the small gangs of contemptible revisionists, he naturally yapped like a mad dog at the fearless Chinese people. He also accused our Party of "violating internationalism". This shows that to him internationalism meant treating the revisionists as our "paternal Party", tagging after the Soviet modern revisionists and following in their steps. This bourgeois servility is diametrically opposed to proletarian internationalism.

At the Second Festival of Literature and Art of the Chinese People's Liberation Army held in June and July that year, Chou Yang made a speech to a meeting of cadres, in which he harped on exactly the same note as the counter-revolutionary line put forward not long afterwards by the Right opportunists at the Lushan Meeting. He

vilified our praise of the great leap forward as "whitewashing", which he claimed "took advantage of the enthusiasm of the masses". He attacked the mass movement and compared our singing of revolutionary songs to "the singing of an old woman which no one wants to hear". He sneered that the working people were not up to writing poetry because "you need inspiration to write poetry". He said that "middle-school students are children of twelve or thirteen" and not qualified to take an interest in politics; thus, requiring them to study politics was "a vulgarization of the policy that education should serve politics". At the mention of the great leap forward or mass movements, including the mass movement for workers, peasants and soldiers to master culture, Chou Yang started ranting and raving, subjecting them to the most scornful attacks. This hatred of socialism and the revolutionary masses stemmed from his bourgeois class nature. People like him who take an antagonistic attitude to mass movements, no matter how high their positions, are bound to batter their heads against a stone wall.

Hard facts have refuted Chou Yang. Today, not only is the whole country from old women down to youngsters singing revolutionary songs, but primary-school children as well as middle-school students of twelve or thirteen are plunging with unprecedented enthusiasm into the great proletarian cultural revolution and launching a full-scale attack on the bourgeoisie!

In this report Chou Yang also demanded wildly: What "scientific works" of our own have we had "in the last ten years"? He tried with one stroke to wipe out the great development of Mao Tse-tung's thought in various fields in the decade after liberation. Truly, this is "like mayflies trying to topple the giant tree, ridiculously over-rating themselves". Listen Chou Yang, bow your head and listen: During the ten years from 1949 to 1959, the Central Committee of the Communist Party published the brilliant *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, which has become the compass for the people of China and the whole world in making revolution. Is this not to be counted as a scientific work? In those ten years Comrade Mao Tse-tung

wrote "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship", "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", "Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work", "On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation" and "On the Ten Main Relationships" . . . great epoch-making Marxist-Leninist works covering the fields of politics, military affairs, philosophy, culture, economics and Party building, which further inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and comprehensively and brought it to a higher and completely new stage. Are these not to be counted as scientific works? In those ten years, Comrade Mao Tse-tung himself led all the great struggles on the ideological front and wrote such famous articles as "Give Serious Attention to the Discussion of the Film *The Life of Wu Hsun*" and "The Bourgeois Orientation of the *Wenhui Bao* Should Be Repudiated", including important instructions directly repudiating you, Chou Yang, as mentioned earlier in this article. Are these not to be counted as scientific works? Are

not your counter-revolutionary features very clear?

When we go to the root of the matter, what Chou Yang meant by scientific works were the foul, wordy hodgepodes, pretentious tomes and textbooks of modern revisionism, which are simply empty talk, "sharp-tongued, thick-skinned and hollow inside". He and his company admired only the Western bodhisattva of revisionism, and rabidly opposed the invincible proletarian revolutionary science of Mao Tse-tung's thought, the living philosophy and living science of the broad masses who have mastered Mao Tse-tung's thought. This fully exposes the essence of the counter-revolutionary revisionist crimes of the gang formerly in charge of the Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee. These crimes must be denounced by the whole Party and punished by the whole people.

In 1961 and 1962, the attack on socialism by the capitalist and feudal forces within the country reached a high tide. The modern revisionists, in collaboration with U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries of all coun-

tries, intensified their blockade, encirclement, slander, infiltration and subversion against China and the Chinese Communist Party. A host of monsters and ghosts emerged, and for a time the adverse current of revisionism was running wild. Chou Yang not only actively organized monsters and demons in literary and art circles to build up public opinion for the plot of the counter-revolutionary revisionist clique to usurp leadership of the Party, the army and the government, but came out himself in a great frenzy to spearhead the attack. He convened many successive conferences in various fields of work, and launched revisionist programmes, one after another. He went all over the country to call meetings in Shanghai, Changchun, Hangchow, Talien, Foochow and Amoy. He made reports all over the place to add fuel to the flames, inciting and instigating monsters and demons to rise up and seize power, to reverse previous correct verdicts made on them, to oppose Chairman Mao and Mao Tse-tung's thought. Virtually all the counter-revolutionary revisionists in literary and art circles obtained their travelling per-

mits from Chou Yang and acted in accordance with his signals. All reactionary classes approaching ruin are so blinded by self-interest that they expose their true features completely to the revolutionary people, and the masses rise up to destroy them. The following are merely a few striking examples:

Chou Yang frenziedly opposed and reviled Mao Tse-tung's thought. He has consistently done so, but hitherto he had invariably camouflaged his acts with counter-revolutionary double-dealing tactics. After 1961, judging that the situation was in his favour and that the plot for bourgeois restoration was going to succeed, he flung off his disguise, came out into the open and burst out in vituperation.

In February 1961, Chou Yang hurried off to Shanghai and at a discussion meeting ranted that some plays used the phrase "thanks to Chairman Mao" outright, "not just once but even three or four times". Thanks to Chairman Mao, thanks to the Communist Party, always follow Chairman Mao and the Party—this is spoken from the hearts of hundreds of millions of

Chinese working people, and is a matter of the first importance that none of the working people liberated from the oppression of the exploiting classes can ever forget. Why did it arouse such deep hatred in Chou Yang? This fully reflects his counter-revolutionary class nature.

In March 1961, Chou Yang, while in Fukiens Province, vilified Mao Tse-tung's thought. He said: "Mao Tse-tung's thought is a red thread, but laid on too thick it ceases to be a red thread and turns into a piece of red cloth. Politics is the soul, but the soul is different from the body. . . . The soul takes up no space and is intangible." In comparing Mao Tse-tung's thought to a thread which "takes up no space and is intangible", Chou Yang obviously intended to expel Mao Tse-tung's thought from all spheres and to put revisionist and capitalist ideology in command. He repeated these utterly vicious statements time and again, wherever he went.

At the forum on literary and art work held in June of that year, Chou Yang warned that "radio and television should not always

be propagating support for Chairman Mao". This was the criminal contention of the "court of the Demon King"—the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee. This again fully revealed his true counter-revolutionary colours. Since you oppose propagating support for Chairman Mao, whom do you propose supporting? You want to "support" back to power a handful of anti-Party elements who have been repudiated by the Party and all the people, so as to bring about a counter-revolutionary restoration. This scheme of yours can only result in ignominious failure.

In July 1962, Chou Yang went to north-east China and opposed "talking of Chairman Mao every day". But we do want to talk of Chairman Mao every day, read his works every day, review his instructions every day and study his thought every day. When we "talk of Chairman Mao every day", there will be no room for monsters and demons to manoeuvre. As soon as they appear they will be discovered; as soon as they act they will be caught.

Chou Yang is a counter-revolutionary revisionist with an inveterate hatred for Mao Tse-tung's thought. All his fine talk was a fraud. Do not the facts cited above show what a reactionary he really is?

Chou Yang tried desperately to reverse the verdicts passed on monsters and demons and to launch vengeful counter-attacks against the revolutionary people. He incited and organized overthrown counter-revolutionaries and bourgeois "authorities" of all descriptions to attack the Party.

On March 19, 1961, the counter-revolutionary "Three-Family Village"¹ gang began to bring out a series of articles under the general

¹"Three-Family Village" was an anti-Party clique formed by the three counter-revolutionary revisionists Teng To, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha. They published articles under the general heading of *Notes from Three-Family Village* in the *Qianxian (Frontline)*, a magazine under their control published by the former Peking Municipal Party Committee. They attacked the Party Central Committee and Chairman Mao, the thought of Mao Tse-tung and the socialist system in their writings and engaged persistently in vicious anti-Party activities

heading *Evening Chats at Yenshan*.¹ Just a week later, on March 26, the *Wenyi Bao* followed this up with a monograph entitled "The Problem of Subject-matter". This out-and-out counter-revolutionary revisionist programme for literature and art was written on the instructions and at the direction of Chou Yang and Lin Mo-han, who polished it carefully. This article put forward the demagogic slogan: "Use every means to open wide the cultural road."

What "cultural road" did they want to open wide?

There is no abstract "cultural road". There is only the life-and-death struggle between

¹The book *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, a big poisonous weed opposing the Party, socialism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung, was written by Teng To, a counter-revolutionary revisionist, under the pseudonym Ma Nan-tsun. The book is a collection of essays written supposedly on random thoughts and using an obscure and yet extremely malicious language. It attacks by innuendo the Party and Chairman Mao, the three Red Flags and the socialist system and spreads a great deal of feudal, capitalist and revisionist poison in order to prepare public opinion for the restoration of capitalism.

the two roads of socialism and capitalism. To open the cultural road for socialist literature and art, one must block the road for reactionary capitalist literature and art. To open the road for reactionary capitalist and feudal literature and art, one must block the road for socialist literature and art. They alleged that "opening wide the cultural road" was intended to "prevent any person with aspirations or ability from being pushed aside or suppressed". This reveals that they actually intended to "use every means" to reverse the verdicts passed on those counter-revolutionaries who had been "pushed aside and suppressed" under the dictatorship of the proletariat, so that monsters and demons with counter-revolutionary "aspirations" might use the press, literature and art to put out as much counter-revolutionary propaganda as they pleased. Clearly, a counter-revolutionary restoration may take the "military road" or the "cultural road". We must "use every means" to smash their dream of staging a come-back by the cultural road, and carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end.

At "forums" of every kind, Chou Yang repeatedly tried to reverse the verdict on these "people with aspirations" who had been "suppressed", frenziedly inciting them to attack the Party.

He crazily sang the praises of the bourgeois Rightists. He said that among the Rightists there were "some very intelligent people" who were very "valuable" and that those young people who opposed Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought were "learned" and "must be trained with care". Taking advantage of his position and power, he tried in every possible way to prop up notoriously vicious and decadent counter-revolutionaries and Rightists, looked on them as "treasures", pulled them into organizations under his control, gave them high positions and handsome salaries, and lavished every care upon them. Even that former traitor and utter scoundrel Chou Tso-jen was granted by Chou Yang a monthly salary of several hundred yuan, helping him to suck the blood of the working people. On the other hand, Chou Yang, Lin Mo-han and company had an inveterate hatred for the

proletarian Left and the young people who assiduously study Mao Tse-tung's thought, denouncing them as having "naive minds, naive feelings and naive tastes", because in their eyes the "intelligent people" were the bourgeois Rightists opposed to Mao Tse-tung's thought and opposed to socialism!

Chou Yang did his best to echo Hu Feng's counter-revolutionary statements and to reverse the verdict passed on Hu Feng. All this reveals that his stand was the same as Hu Feng's. He said: "Hu Feng declares that literary and art circles in China have been dominated for twenty years by mechanicalism. . . . If we do not make a good job of carrying out the policy of 'letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend', we shall have nothing but bishops robed in red, nuns and monks with ossified ideas, who cannot open their mouths without citing Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. It would be thoroughly exasperating. I have always remembered this statement of Hu Feng's." (June 16, 1961.) What vicious talk! Hu Feng was the criminal ringleader of a counter-revolutionary

clique, yet Chou Yang treated his words as the "family behests" of an ancestor which he "always bears in mind" because he fully shared Hu Feng's inveterate hatred of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. When he spoke of people who "cannot open their mouths without citing Mao Tse-tung's thought", he was thinking of the criticism made by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in "Reform Our Study" of those who persisted in Wang Ming's line, who "cannot open their mouths without citing ancient Greece".¹ These people included Chou Yang, in whom this criticism had rankled ever since, so that now he broke out in abuse. He felt "thoroughly exasperated" at people who "cannot open their mouths without citing Mao Tse-tung's thought" because he was a bourgeois, a comprador, who could not open his mouth to his own satisfaction without citing foreigners, without quoting Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dubrolyubov. Chou

¹ Mao Tse-tung, "Reform Our Study", *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, Vol. III, p. 19.

Yang praised Hu Feng's theory of the "sores of mental enslavement", calling on writers to act upon Hu Feng's counter-revolutionary theory and write about the "backwardness, superstition, prejudices, suspiciousness and so forth" of the working people, thus defaming and insulting them. His "criticism" of Hu Feng was an out-and-out fraud to hoodwink people. It makes us seethe with anger and want to vomit, the way he parroted Hu Feng's utterly venomous phrases about "bishops robed in red, nuns and monks" and their "ossified ideas". His use of these scurrilous expressions to vilify the proletarian Left, the workers, peasants and soldiers who study Mao Tse-tung's thought, exposes him clearly as a black-hearted revisionist. In fact, the label a "bishop robed in red" suits Chou Yang himself. Was he not masquerading in a red robe while waving a black flag and taking command over the cultural front?

In June 1961, Chou Yang again declared, "We must foster the spirit of Hai Jui in appealing to the emperor." This was after the performance of *Hai Jui Dismissed from*

Office,¹ when the "brothers" of "Three-Family Village" had "broken out" and were attacking again to "recoup their losses". On the directions of Chou Yang and Chi Yen-ming, the former secretary of the leading Party members' group in the Ministry of Culture, there appeared a host of poisonous weeds like *Hsieh Yao-huan*² and *Li Hui-*

¹ *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* is a reactionary historical play written by Wu Han, a counter-revolutionary revisionist. Through the mouths of the ancients it tries to voice the "grievances" of the Right opportunists who have been "dismissed from office" by the people. The real objective of the play is to call on these Right opportunists to rise to power again.

² *Hsieh Yao-huan* is a historical play written by Tien Han, an anti-Party element. It is an anti-Party, anti-socialist "poisonous weed". *Hsieh Yao-huan*, the leading character in the play, was a woman official under the Empress Wu Tse-tien of the Tang Dynasty (618-907). As the seizure of large areas of land by the nobles and powerful despots in the south was endangering the empress's rule, she was sent on a tour of inspection of the south with the aim of safeguarding the interests of the feudal ruling class. She was murdered by these same nobles and despots.

niang.¹ Chou Yang time and again preached "the spirit of Hai Jui" in the hope of organizing a big offensive against the Central Committee of the Party and of reversing the verdicts passed on the Rightist opportunists. In 1962, again, those in charge of the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee proposed learning from Wei Cheng.² What with "the spirit of Hai Jui" and "the spirit of Wei Cheng", they had found a common counter-revolutionary language.

¹ *Li Hui-niang*, a *kunchu* opera, written by the anti-Party element Meng Chao, is another big anti-Party, anti-socialist poisonous weed. *Li Hui-niang*, the leading character in the opera, was a concubine of her murderer Chia Szu-tao, a treacherous prime minister during the last days of the Southern Sung Dynasty (1127-1279). The author painted the "spirit of revenge" of her ghost in glowing colours in an insidious attack on the socialist system and the dictatorship of the proletariat, implying that the anti-Party elements and the monsters and demons in society had been unjustly treated.

² Wei Cheng (580-643), a minister under the Tang Dynasty's emperor Li Shih-min, was noted in history for his "courage to speak out".

Chou Yang also said, "First of all we must change the relationship between the rulers and the ruled, between those who reform others and those who are reformed." This bluntly expressed Chou Yang's aim, which was to change the dictatorship of the proletariat so that those who were ruled — counter-revolutionaries, Hu Feng elements, Hai Jui, Wei Cheng and so forth — could become rulers and flock on to the stage to establish their ruthless dictatorship and suppress the revolutionary people.

Chou Yang advocated bourgeois "liberalization" everywhere, hoping to turn every association, every troupe and organization in literary and art circles into a Petofi Club. The core of "Some Suggestions on the Present Work in Literature and Art" (draft), the so-called "Ten Points on Literature and Art" released in July 1961 and revised and published on August 1 by Chou Yang and company, was aimed at overthrowing Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art and the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao in the field of

literature and art to carry out bourgeois liberalization.

The "Ten Points on Literature and Art" stated that as regards the "question of how to make literature and art serve politics" there was "narrow, one-sided and incorrect understanding". This was an exact replica of Chou Yang's sinister words. The "narrow understanding" so hated by Chou Yang was the concept that literature and art should actively serve the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and that they should be regarded as an ideological weapon of the proletarian revolution. The "broadness" he advocated time and again in the "Ten Points on Literature and Art" meant "there should be no restriction on subjects", or "we should help people see the diversity of the world, the laws of history and the complex nature of life", as was argued in the article "The Problem of Subject-matter" in the *Wenyi Bao*.

"There should be no restrictions" was a counter-revolutionary slogan of the Petofi Club. Everything is restricted by specific conditions; there is nothing in the world

that is unrestricted. The question is whether these restrictions are revolutionary or counter-revolutionary, progressive or reactionary. If proletarian literature and art are to serve proletarian politics, they have to be restricted by proletarian politics. Politics should be in command of literature and art and the question of subject-matter should naturally be considered from the point of view of the political interests of the proletariat. Without this kind of restriction, they would be restricted by the politics of the bourgeoisie and turn into bourgeois literature and art. Indeed, the restrictions imposed by bourgeois counter-revolutionary politics at this time resulted in the emergence of a conglomeration of poisonous works "using the past to satirize the present" and "venerating what was foreign but despising what was Chinese", as well as anti-socialist films, operas and novels "discarding the classics and rebelling against orthodoxy", and "on middle characters". We must expose the bourgeois idealist lies on the question of "restrictions" to help people see clearly that Chou Yang's advocacy of "no

restrictions" meant in actual fact that literature and art should not be restricted by the six political criteria formulated by Chairman Mao and by serving the workers, peasants and soldiers. It meant that emperors, princes, generals, ministers, scholars and beauties and every kind of monster should dominate literary and art circles to carry out a counter-revolutionary restoration.

The "diversity of the world" meant, in fact, just one thing: that was to glamorize and praise the "diversity" of the ugly features of the decadent landlord and bourgeois elements and their intellectuals. To Chou Yang, the creation of proletarian heroes and the praising of the infinitely magnificent life of the workers, peasants and soldiers were "narrow" and "monotonous". On the other hand, devoting great efforts to writing about the rotten life of the bourgeoisie was "diversity" and "enjoyment of beauty". The "complex nature of life" was in fact very simple. It was none other than class reconciliation and class capitulation, exemplified by a Red Army soldier embracing a counter-revolutionary White bandit, as presented in

revisionist literature and art. It was none other than the dirty trick of glorifying traitors, lackeys, hooligans, landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists as that shown in revisionist literature and art; and grotesque descriptions of the abnormal psychology and schizophrenia of the exploiting class admired in revisionist literature and art. In 1959, Khrushchov shamelessly lauded the "great significance" of Sholokhov's *A Man's Lot* by saying that he "described the complex and rich spiritual world of the ordinary citizen". The reason why Khrushchov's "yes-men" wanted us to write about the "complex nature of life" was surely to make us emulate the renegade literature of Sholokhov and his like.

Chou Yang made great efforts to sell the contraband goods of modern revisionism by raising the revisionist slogan of "literature and art of the whole people". The 22nd Congress of the CPSU which began in October 1961 proclaimed the "state of the whole people" and the "Party of the entire people" and thus nakedly exposed its treach-

ery in replacing the proletarian dictatorship with the bourgeois dictatorship. Chou Yang responded rapidly. He took the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the publication of "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art" in May 1962 to carry out a big plot, waving "red flags" to oppose the red flag. On the pretext of "writing articles" and "summing up experience", he brought together in Peking all the bourgeois "authorities" under him to launch a flood of opposition to Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art. Led by Chou Yang and Lin Mo-han, they lived like lords while plotting all day long how to strike at the Left and oppose the Party, socialism and Chairman Mao, conducting many foul intrigues. In the end they produced "On Unifying, Tempering and Elevating Our Literary and Art Contingents" (a *Wenyi Bao* editorial), "Twenty Militant, Victorious Years" by Ho Chi-fang, "Some Questions Concerning Characterization" by Chen Huang-mei, and "Soliloquy on the Question of Originality in Films" by Chu Pai-yin. . . . These big poisonous weeds and many others opposed Mao

Tse-tung's thought and viciously and comprehensively distorted and attacked Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art. Chou Yang was himself responsible for an editorial in the *Renmin Ribao*. He devoted one meeting on March 15 to giving detailed instructions as to what this editorial should say and setting its tone. Later he revised the draft very carefully. It was published under the title "Serve the Broadest Mass of the People". Its central point was substituting Khrushchov's "literature and art of the whole people" for proletarian literature and art, and using the concept of serving "the whole people" to replace Mao Tse-tung's orientation for literature and art — that of serving the workers, peasants and soldiers.

"Literature and art of the whole people" was Chou Yang's revisionist line all along. He repeatedly put forward such revisionist slogans as "literature and art of the whole people" and "culture of the whole people". After the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, when he felt he had the backing of his foreign boss and the approval of the chief of the counter-revolutionary revisionist clique, he

transformed this slogan into an anti-Party, anti-socialist programme and foisted it off on the entire Party in the form of a *Renmin Ribao* editorial.

This editorial said: "The entire people, within the people's democratic united front with the workers, peasants and soldiers as the mainstay, should be the audience for our literature and art and the audience for which we work." This was an utterly vicious alteration of Mao Tse-tung's thought. In the "Talks at the Yanan Forum on Literature and Art" Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out very clearly that our literature and art are **"in the first place for the workers, peasants and soldiers; they are created for the workers, peasants and soldiers and are for their use"**.¹ He also spoke of **"the problem of audience, i.e. the people for whom our works of literature and art are produced"**,² saying that in the base areas **"the audience**

¹ Mao Tse-tung, "Talks at the Yanan Forum on Literature and Art", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. III, p. 84.

² *Ibid.*, p. 71.

for works of literature and art consists of workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary cadres".¹ To serve the workers, peasants and soldiers and take them as the audience has always been the basic orientation and class line of proletarian literature and art over the last twenty years, the fundamental condition determining the class nature of our literature and art. This is even more valid in the present period of socialist revolution. Chou Yang tried to use the "united front" to change secretly the orientation of literature and art for workers, peasants and soldiers by insisting on making the bourgeoisie the audience for our literature and art. His purpose was to change the class nature of proletarian literature and art and turn them into a counter-revolutionary tool in the hands of the bourgeoisie. By taking the bourgeoisie and other targets of our revolution as the "audience for which we work", Chou Yang wanted us to glorify the bourgeoisie instead of criticizing it, and he used this revisionist line of "literature and art of

¹ *Ibid.*

the whole people" to oppose Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art, thus "opening wide the cultural road" in the interests of the come-back of the bourgeoisie.

The editorial also raised the slogan: "Strengthen the ties of writers and artists with the masses." This is a revisionist slogan taken over sum and substance from Khrushchov, who once made a report entitled "Literature and Art Must Maintain Close Links with the Life of the People". The "programme" for phoney communism adopted at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU wrote in line with his report: "The main road of literature and art lies in the strengthening of links with the life of the people." The Soviet revisionists admire and ardently advocate the slogan "links with the life of the people" because this means the abandonment of revolution and the glorification of counter-revolution. First, it places writers and artists in the position of high and mighty aristocrats and overlords; it calls only for "links" with "the people" and is entirely against their integration with the workers, peasants and soldiers. Second, by the "peo-

ple" Khrushchov meant precisely the "whole people", precisely the bourgeoisie and the high-salaried stratum. "Close links with the people" means close links with the bourgeoisie and the high-salaried stratum and service to the bourgeoisie. Third, this slogan eliminates the ideological remoulding of writers and artists so that bourgeois writers can retain their bourgeois world outlook intact and boldly write their anti-socialist reactionary works. And fourth, Petofi Clubs may also become a form of "strengthening of links with the life of the people", thus legitimizing counter-revolutionary organizations and counter-revolutionary activities. Chou Yang's purpose in taking over the slogan regarded by modern revisionism as the "main line" of the literature and art was to negate Comrade Mao Tse-tung's instructions that writers and artists "must for a long period of time unreservedly and wholeheartedly go among the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, go into the heat of the struggle". His aim was to enable the revisionist line to dominate literary and art circles in China more completely.

Enough. This man had a mania for making reports. It is impossible to quote all the counter-revolutionary statements in the endless long and short reports made by Chou Yang during the last few years. From the facts already adduced, his true features are adequately evident. In this great storm of attack by the bourgeoisie upon the proletariat, the double-dealer Chou Yang completely exposed his true counter-revolutionary colours. But "a thing turns into its opposite if it goes too far". The complete exposure of a counter-revolutionary in his full arrogance only serves to provide a lethal weapon for the revolutionaries' counter-attack. It was in this way that Chou Yang and company prepared their own downfall.

**SMASH THE STUBBORN RESISTANCE OF
THE BLACK LINE AND CARRY THE
GREAT PROLETARIAN CULTURAL
REVOLUTION THROUGH
TO THE END**

Up to the very eve of the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of

the Party in September 1962, Chou Yang continued to take an active part in conspiratorial activities against Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee. In collusion with a handful of anti-Party careerists, he actively supported and encouraged the publication of the anti-Party novel *Liu Chih-tan*, which was aimed at reversing the decision on the anti-Party element Kao Kang. Chou Yang personally received the anti-Party author of this novel and gave it his final clearance, praising it as "a model", "setting a good example". They attempted to use this novel to whitewash Kao Kang's anti-Party crimes, distort Party history and negate the correct verdict of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao on the Kao Kang — Jao Shu-shih anti-Party alliance.

Their anti-Party scheme was soon seen through by the Central Committee and Chairman Mao. At the Tenth Plenary Session of the Party's Eighth Central Committee, which was one of great historic significance, Comrade Mao Tse-tung once again emphasized the theory of contradiction, classes and

class struggle in a socialist society and directly criticized Chou Yang and company.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out that it was a great invention to use novels to carry out anti-Party activities. To overthrow a political power, it was always necessary first of all to build up public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere. This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counter-revolutionary class.

Chairman Mao and the Central Committee of the Party once again seriously criticized Chou Yang and company and patiently gave them another chance. But again Chou Yang adopted counter-revolutionary double-dealing tactics to resist Comrade Mao Tse-tung's directive. After the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee, he made use of his position and power and relied on the support of the anti-Party careerists who had wormed their way up to important posts in the Party, government and army to suppress the counter-attack from the Left, and once again did his utmost by means of double-dealing tricks to preserve the forces of the anti-Party, anti-socialist black line in

order to continue to fight the proletariat. From then on, one life-and-death battle after another took place on the broad ideological front.

1. No sooner was the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Party over than Chou Yang, trying to cover up his anti-Party crimes, hastily "reported back" to those participating in the forum on literary and art work on October 19, 1962. While posing as Left "who cannot claim to have made very full mental preparation", he distorted the spirit of the Tenth Plenary Session of the Party Central Committee by saying that "the basic situation is good" in literary and art circles and that "not many . . . anti-Party, anti-Marxist works have been published" in an attempt to pass many big poisonous weeds off as fragrant flowers and numb the revolutionary people. Moreover, he said, "going to the other extreme should also be avoided", implying that people should refrain from criticizing the bourgeoisie and from eliminating poisonous weeds. As the proletariat was about to counter-attack, he resolved to resist to the end.

2. Immediately after, a "forum on Confucius", approved, directed and plotted by Chou Yang, was held in Shantung in November 1962. This was Chou Yang's counter-attack on the revolutionary spirit of the Tenth Plenary Session of the Party Central Committee, a counter-attack in collusion with a horde of monsters and demons. At this sinister forum the bourgeois Rightists' recklessness went to the furthest extreme and, for the first time since liberation, staged the ludicrous farce of bowing in worship to their feudal ancestors.

3. On New Year's Day 1963, in accordance with the spirit of the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee and Comrade Mao Tse-tung's directive, Comrade Ko Ching-shih proposed to the Shanghai literary and art workers that they should "write about the past thirteen years", in the hope that writers and artists would make every effort to reflect the reality of the socialist revolution and construction during this period and extol the heroic figures of workers, peasants and soldiers. This revolutionary proposal was at once resisted and at-

tacked by the revisionist clique in literary and art circles headed by Chou Yang. At the meeting on literature and art convened by the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in April 1963, Chou Yang organized Lin Mo-han, Shao Chuan-lin and a handful of others in group discussions as well as in general meetings to make a concerted attack on the slogan "write about the past thirteen years". Chou Yang entered the lists himself at this meeting and also at the enlarged meeting of council members of the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Circles held on April 27, when he pontificated, "No matter what themes you write on, they can all reflect the spirit of the time. . . . You must not think that writing about the present alone is of prime importance." Yet when Chou Yang delivered a speech to the young spare-time writers at the end of 1965, he solemnly made the criticism that "three years ago" when "writing about the past thirteen years" was proposed, "some comrades said they could not accept this proposal". This was to make it seem that he

had been an activist at that time. What out-and-out hypocrisy! How could this lying braggart be so shameless?

4. During the first half of 1963, Comrade Mao Tse-tung sharply criticized "plays about ghosts" and the depicting of "emperors and ministers, scholars and beauties". He sternly pointed out that the Ministry of Culture under the leadership of Chou Yang, Chi Yen-ming, Hsia Yen and Lin Mo-han was a ministry of "emperors and ministers, scholars and beauties". But in his talks on the work in the theatre in August and October that year, Chou Yang insisted that "advocating plays about ghosts is not necessarily a reflection of bourgeois ideology", trying by might and by main to resist Chairman Mao's criticism. In addition, basing himself on the absurd arguments of the anti-Party careerists under whose wing he took shelter, Chou Yang advocated "a division of labour", declaring that "Peking opera, in particular, is suited to depicting emperors and ministers". In this way he concocted theoretical grounds for opposing plays on contemporary revolutionary themes. More-

over, Chou Yang even bragged that "much had been achieved" in the reform of the dramatic arts. This was a vain attempt to cover up the criminal fact that "emperors and ministers, scholars and beauties" dominated the stage.

5. In September 1963, Chou Yang called a conference of leading personnel of the institutes under the Department of Philosophy and Social Science of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and of various newspapers and publications. He took the lead in launching a concerted attack on the revolutionary article "A Comment on the 'Autobiography of Li Hsiu-cheng'"¹ by Comrade Chi Pen-yu.

¹Li Hsiu-cheng (1823-64) was a commander of the peasant insurgent army towards the end of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, which fought against the rule of the Ching Dynasty. After his capture by the Ching troops in 1864, he surrendered to the enemy and turned a shameless traitor. During his imprisonment, he wrote his memories known as the "Autobiography of Li Hsiu-cheng", but actually it was a "confession" which betrayed the peasant revolutionary movement of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom.

Chou Yang bellowed at the conference: "Li Hsiu-cheng was a national hero. It is completely wrong to call him a renegade." He directed Teng To, Chien Po-tsan and that crew to refute Chi Pen-yu. Chairman Mao discovered this plot in good time and put a stop to it.

6. In October 1963, Chou Yang made a report at an enlarged meeting of the Department of Philosophy and Social Science of the Academy of Sciences. In the third part of his report, devoted to the tasks at home, there was no mention at all of the serious, militant task on the current ideological front. On the contrary, he dwelt at length on "doing editing and research work in the historical heritage". Employing the double-talk of the clique in the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee, he made an all-out attack on "the oversimplified method of using labels indiscriminately". Here "labels" referred to the method of class analysis. At this meeting he discriminated against the Left forces but encouraged a large group of revisionists and bourgeois "authorities" to dominate the

meeting. Thus Teng To was among those called upon to make reports on "anti-revisionism" in the history group. Was this a joke, getting Teng To to lead the "opposition to revisionism"? No, this was political trafficking. Since Chou Yang sought the backing of the counter-revolutionary careerists, he was bound to support the "Three-Family Village", which was under their control.

7. In December 1963, in view of the reactionary domination of literary and art circles by the anti-Party black line, Comrade Mao Tse-tung again sharply pointed out that **problems abound in all forms of art such as the drama, ballads, music, the fine arts, the dance, the cinema, poetry and literature and the people involved are numerous; in many departments very little has been achieved so far in socialist transformation. The "dead" still dominate in many departments.** Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: **Isn't it absurd that many Communists are enthusiastic about promoting feudal and capitalist art, but not socialist art?** These were diametrically opposed to Chou Yang's line cited

above that "much had been achieved" in the dramatic arts. They hit the nail on the head and laid bare Chou Yang's reactionary standpoint. But in a vain attempt to slip through, Chou Yang continued to argue. At a meeting in January 1964, he openly opposed Chairman Mao's instructions. He said: "The mistake committed by the Ministry of Culture is not necessarily a mistake of line. . . . In the case of the majority of people, including the leadership of the literary and art departments and myself, it is a question of understanding." By using the word "including", he thought he could re-enact his counter-revolutionary double-dealing manoeuvre of saying a few words by way of self-criticism and transforming himself and his band into persons who were correct.

8. Since Chou Yang and company had time and again resisted the directives of the Party Central Committee, Comrade Mao Tse-tung in June 1964 once more very incisively criticized the revisionist leaders of literary and art circles and gave a sharp warning to Chou Yang and his band. This was the instructions mentioned in the first

section of this article, the one that Chou Yang tampered with. Seeing that the situation was risky and that further resistance would spell doom, Chou Yang staged a "rectification movement" in the Ministry of Culture. This was a sham "rectification movement" aimed at fooling the masses, suppressing the Left forces, shielding the bad elements and covering himself. In a "report" which he made in November 1964, Chou Yang took advantage of the opportunity of "criticizing" Hsia Yen and others to boost himself by saying that since the Yanan Forum on Literature and Art he had been "working under the guidance of Chairman Mao". "My mistake was different from your errors of line", he said, adding that his mistake sprang from "lack of experience". This means no criticism of Chou Yang was allowed while criticism of others should also be done under "leadership", that is, "everything must have" the "approval" of their counter-revolutionary revisionist "leadership". This was the stratagem used by the Imitation Foreign Devil in *The True Story of Ah Q* — revolution is forbidden.

9. In July 1964 a national festival of Peking operas on contemporary themes was held, to which Chairman Mao gave his personal attention. Chou Yang and his bosses behind the scenes, who had consistently opposed Peking opera on contemporary revolutionary themes, now simulated a sudden enthusiasm for it. Chou Yang again played the "summing up" role. Though he did his best to appear most revolutionary, his much revised speech still showed him up. He described Hsia Yen's talk with Hongkong reporters, which distorted the revolution of Peking opera, as "underestimating the Peking operas on contemporary themes". He also declared, "We don't mean that the whole of *Hsieh Yao-huan* is reactionary", in a desperate effort to absolve Tien Han of his counter-revolutionary crimes.

10. In response to the call of Chairman Mao, criticism and repudiation of the reactionary viewpoints of Yang Hsien-chen and Chou Ku-cheng and a number of bad films was launched at the beginning of 1965. Knowing full well that the deepening of this criticism and repudiation would threat-

en his counter-revolutionary rule, Chou Yang used every trick to quash them. He used his old counter-revolutionary double-dealing tactics: on the one hand he pretended to be in favour of the criticism and repudiation; on the other hand he bided his time and as soon as he had the chance diverted the movement to the right. When the criticism reached a high tide at the end of February, Chou Yang and Lin Mo-han promptly called a meeting in Peking of the chief editors of some major newspapers and had a talk with them under the pretext of "making a summing-up". They violently condemned the articles recently published criticizing all kinds of poisonous weeds as "firing dud shells", "lacking in analysis", "dogmatic", "haphazard guesses", "exaggeration", and "simply pinning on labels" and launched a frenzied counter-attack. They abused and ridiculed the reviews written by workers, peasants and soldiers as "over-simplified" and "unable to take the place of reviews by specialists" in order to suppress criticism by workers, peasants and soldiers. They declared: "In the criticism

and repudiation of Hsia Yen, Tien Han and others, the past must be differentiated from the present and political from academic issues." They added: "These people have already stopped voicing some of their old views . . . so they should not be brought up again." These two claims constituted a counter-attack on the cultural revolution initiated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. It was an attempt to force a halt to criticism of the bourgeoisie. This manoeuvre proved effective, and numerous articles criticizing and repudiating the bourgeoisie were then locked up in the "court of the Demon King".

11. In September 1965, imagining that the revolutionary masses had been silenced and that their own position was secure, Chou Yang and company moved to the third stage of their three-part intrigue and frantically launched a vengeful counter-attack against the Party. They called a national conference in Peking of all heads of cultural bureaux and departments. Chou Yang and his bosses behind the scenes all attended this conference, at which they wildly slandered Comrade Mao Tse-tung. They invited Hsia

Yen and Yang Han-sheng to the presidium where they sat as proud as peacocks, continuing to exercise their dictatorship over the proletariat. In his report, Chou Yang time and again consoled them, saying, "Don't let yourselves be obsessed by the fact that you've been criticized. It's inevitable that sometimes criticism is too harsh or too slight. . . . There may be too little of it or too much." This was a hint that if it were "too much" or "too harsh", they could have the verdicts reversed. As long as he remained in power they would not be overthrown but some day could stage a come-back. He again described himself as merely "late in discovering and slow in rectifying" mistakes, saying that his was "a problem of understanding". He imagined that by doing so he could help this gang to slip through and continue to exercise dictatorship over the proletariat.

12. Finally, let us turn to the report Chou Yang made to the National Conference of Young Activists in Spare-Time Literary Writing on November 29, 1965. This took place nineteen days after the initiation of

the criticism of the play *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* — a critical moment in the life-and-death struggle of the proletarian Left against the bourgeois Rightists. In an effort stubbornly to resist Comrade Mao Tse-tung's instructions on criticizing the representatives of the bourgeoisie, the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists in the former Peking Municipal Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, the former Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee and the former Ministry of Culture undertook a series of anti-Party, anti-socialist conspiratorial manoeuvres, desperately attacked the Left and shielded the Rightists in a vain attempt to stamp out the approaching flames of the great proletarian cultural revolution. At this crucial moment, Chou Yang fought every inch of the way in his resistance to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's thoroughly revolutionary instructions. In his report, he did not even mention the current tempestuous struggle, as if there had never been any criticism of *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*. In January 1966 his report was published officially. That was

more than a month after it had been made, and during this period the revolutionary people's struggle to criticize *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* had grown, while the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists were putting up a last-ditch fight. In the report published in the press Chou Yang flagrantly persisted in distorting Comrade Mao Tse-tung's instructions, showing his determination to resist to the bitter end.

See how obdurately they resisted the directives of the Party Central Committee and Comrade Mao Tse-tung! How bitterly they hated the proletarian Left! Even when the flames of revolution threatened to burn them, they stubbornly refused to give ground. Instead they mobilized all the forces of their black line and black gang to counter-attack.

When we review the struggles in the field of literature and art since liberation, we can see clearly the sharp struggle between the two lines. One is the red line, Mao Tse-tung's line on literature and art. It is Comrade Mao Tse-tung who has personally led every major struggle, impelled the cultural rev-

olution forward step by step and after long preparations started the present great proletarian cultural revolution, a stormy general offensive against the bourgeoisie in which hundreds of millions of people are taking part and which has smashed the old lair of Chou Yang and company. The other is a black line, the anti-Party, anti-socialist bourgeois line on literature and art, whose ring-leader was Chou Yang. Behind him stood the counter-revolutionary clique which plotted to usurp the leadership of the Party, the army and the government and which has recently been crushed. And this black line included Hu Feng, Feng Hsueh-feng, Ting Ling, Ai Ching, Chin Chao-yang, Lin Mo-han, Tien Han, Hsia Yen, Yang Han-sheng, Chi Yen-ming, Chen Huang-mei, Shao Chuan-lin and the rest. Despite the quarrels between their different blocs and their efforts to oust each other, they had one thing in common: their bourgeois reactionary political stand opposing Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, the masses, workers, peasants and soldiers, the Communist Party and socialism. Chou Yang,

who "criticized" Hu Feng, quoted Hu Feng's venomous statements precisely because the two of them took the same stand. By means of such underhand tactics as alternating attacks with friendly advances, offering high posts and other favours, recruiting renegades and singing one another's praises, Chou Yang and company enlisted a gang of traitors, counter-revolutionaries, Rightists and megalomaniacs, and ensconced them in various positions as their anti-Party, anti-socialist tools. They also tried by hook and by crook to poison the minds of young people so as to turn them into successors to the bourgeoisie and criminally pulled young writers into their anti-Party, anti-socialist gangster inn. This black line controlled cultural circles and all cultural associations. It also reached out its tentacles to every part of the country and used "membership" regulations and overlapping "associations and unions" to keep a group of bourgeois writers and to attack and oust workers, peasants and soldiers, thus creating many "Petofi Clubs" large and small. This black line served the interests of restoration of

capitalism. We must now smash all these "Petofi Clubs" and destroy the revisionist "court of the Demon King". We must take over, and take over thoroughly, the leadership of all literary and art organizations now in the hands of the bourgeoisie. We must smash to smithereens all corrupt bourgeois and feudal relationships.

Chou Yang was a self-styled Marxist theoretician. Usurping Party leadership in the field of culture and taking advantage of his position as a Party leader and academic overlord he posed as the Party's spokesman on literature and art. He kept blowing his own trumpet and browbeating others to create this false impression. Things develop by stages, and a process of observation is often required to understand a phenomenon and recognize its essence which, hidden at first, needs some time to be fully exposed. There is nothing strange about this. It has happened before and is likely to happen again. But once the true colours of these "big shots" opposed to Mao Tse-tung's thought are revealed, when we look back at their careers we can detect the meagre

essence of their huge imposture. Careful examination of Chou Yang's published writings and private talks shows that they abound in reactionary twaddle and are riddled with mistakes and obvious fallacies. As for Chou Yang's own "theories on literature and art", these are simply a hotchpotch copied piecemeal from foreign books. There is nothing in the least wonderful about them.

Chou Yang always boasted that he came from "the Liberated Area". In fact, while at Yen-an he was a bird of the same feather as such Trotskyites, renegades and anti-Party writers as Wang Shih-wei, Ting Ling, Hsiao Chun and Ai Ching. Chou Yang is a member of the bourgeoisie who wormed his way into the revolutionary ranks. In the thirties he carried out Wang Ming's line and opposed the proletarian line on literature and art represented by Lu Hsun. Early in the forties, at Yen-an, he went on stubbornly proclaiming, "In aesthetics, I am a faithful disciple of Chernyshevsky." (*Jiefang Ribao*, July 17, 1941.) He went to the revolutionary base, it is true, but he detested it. From July 17 to 19 in 1941, the *Jiefang*

Ribao published three of his anti-Party essays entitled "Chats on Literature and Life". These made the slanderous attack, "Yen-an has its own circle, with its own patterns. Everybody wears the same uniform and draws pretty well the same pay. . . . If you walk down the street, the people all around you are spouting the same old revolutionary terms. How dead-dull and monotonous this is!" He used the counter-revolutionary expressions of a bourgeois "opposition party" to attack Yen-an as being "too narrow", "too dead", "an impossible place to fit into". He frantically blethered, "Yen-an must on no account remain satisfied with the rut it is in, but must do its best to improve, to become broader and more comprehensive." (*Jiefang Ribao*, July 19, 1941.) And this was written in Yen-an, where Chairman Mao was, the centre of the revolution sacred to all the people of China! This was exactly the same venomous line as that taken by Wang Shih-wei. As soon as Chou Yang reached a place in which the proletariat held power, his bourgeois nature made him burst out in bitter vituperation against the Party.

“Comprehensive” meant the inclusion of monsters and demons. And sure enough, these three anti-Party essays of Chou Yang’s prompted a batch of preposterous counter-revolutionary writings, including Wang Shih-wei’s “Wild Lilies”, Ting Ling’s “Thoughts on Women’s Day” and Ai Ching’s “Understand and Respect Writers”. Chou Yang’s reactionary stand and views were sharply criticized by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in the “Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art”. But he always turned a deaf ear to Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s criticism and would never integrate himself with the workers, peasants and soldiers. He refused, despite repeated warnings, to change his reactionary bourgeois nature, and during the period of socialist revolution he went a step further and developed an out-and-out revisionist line.

Chou Yang is a counter-revolutionary double-dealer. It is largely owing to these double-dealing tricks of his that he was able to fool people for so long. We must learn to recognize double-dealers of this type. Double-dealing is one of the tactics used in

the struggle against us by class enemies who have wormed their way into the proletarian ranks. When the dictatorship of the proletariat is strong, their only way to escape detection is by waving “red flags” to oppose the red flag. They say one thing in public, another in private, act one way to your face and another behind your back, and use Marxist phraseology to peddle their contraband revisionist wares. They retreat when circumstances are unpropitious and attack when the time seems ripe, making bogus self-criticisms to cover up before striking back with real offensives. They recruit renegades and gang up together in order to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and achieve their final aim, that of a restoration of capitalism. These are their whole set of tactics. To recognize double-dealers of this type we must look at their political stand at crucial junctures, especially at times when the bourgeoisie is launching frenzied attacks upon the proletariat. We must not be taken in by their specious writings which change to suit the prevailing political climate. A mass move-

ment is needed to expose these double-dealers. Now the fierce flames of this great proletarian cultural revolution have reduced Chou Yang's camouflage to ashes, laying bare his ugly and contemptible soul.

Will all be well in literary and art circles now that Chou Yang's black line has been exposed? No. Exposure is not the same thing as uprooting, not to speak of eliminating his line's influence. After this black line is uprooted, others may appear, which we shall have to struggle against. All class struggles and political struggles are bound to be reflected in one form or another in literature and art. A long fight still lies ahead. True proletarian revolutionaries must set themselves new and ever greater fighting tasks as the situation develops, and on no account lower their vigilance or let their heads be turned by success in one encounter.

As Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said, **the great proletarian cultural revolution is a revolution which touches men to the depths of their souls.** It reveals their basic political stand, the inmost recesses of their world

outlook, the path each one has travelled and is going to travel, and the history of the entire Chinese revolution. This is the greatest revolutionary change ever undergone by mankind, one which will temper a whole generation of staunch Communists. The present situation is excellent, but there are twists and turns in the path of struggle. We must be prepared for reversals, for ups and downs, and for all kinds of frauds. We may meet with counter-attacks or with soft-soap tactics from the forces of reaction. We must be ready to fight many more rounds. However, victory is bound to go to the proletarian revolutionary Left armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought who know well how to learn and to unite the masses, and who will carry the revolution through to the end. **"Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge"** — only by faithfully acting on these instructions of Chairman Mao's and successfully summing up our experience can we ensure that our knowledge increases steadily with the development of objective processes; only so can we acquire the real ability to dare to make revolution and be

adept at making revolution. The swirling tide of this great cultural revolution has washed away a few worthless survivors from the old world along with the various corrupt systems and mental fetters handed down by the exploiting classes. The Chinese people are uniting more closely than ever before under our great leader Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Holding high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, they are taking revolutionary strides forward and jubilantly creating a new, communist world which will be red through and through.

—*Hongqi (Red Flag)*, No. 1, 1967

评反革命两面派周扬

姚文元著

*

外文出版社出版(北京)

1967年袖珍本第一版

编号:(英)3050-1664

00027

3-E-834Pc

