

On

Stanislavsky's

“System”

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**On
Stanislavsky's
"System"**

By Shanghai Revolutionary Mass
Criticism Writing Group

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1969

**Quotation from
Chairman Mao Tsetung**

One of our current important tasks on the ideological front is to unfold criticism of revisionism.

IN his Political Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, Vice-Chairman Lin Piao pointed out:

We must continue to hold high the banner of revolutionary mass criticism and use Mao Tsetung Thought to criticize the bourgeoisie, to criticize revisionism and all kinds of Right or extreme "Left" erroneous ideas which run counter to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and to criticize bourgeois individualism and the theory of "many centres", that is, the theory of "no centre".

An important task for the proletariat in the sphere of the theatre is to criticize Stanislavsky's "system", one of the theoretical foundations of modern revisionist

literature and art, which the Soviet revisionists laud as "Marxist".

What kind of person is Stanislavsky? A bourgeois reactionary art "authority". Scared to death by the Russian revolution of 1905, he fled to Germany with his repertoire of plays which lauded the tsar and the aristocracy. He was applauded and given an audience by the German emperor Wilhelm II. When the Great October Revolution took place, Stanislavsky admitted that he had again found himself "in an impasse" and that "it was necessary to take a look... from a distance".¹ Taking along his theatrical company he scurried off to the United States where he was on terms of intimacy with the imperialists. He grieved over the lost "peaceful" days of tsarist times and cursed the revolution for having caused "war,

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 1, p. 464.

hunger, world catastrophe, mutual misunderstanding and hate".¹

The period from the failure of the 1905 revolution to the upsurge of the October Revolution was a time of reaction in Russian politics. To put out the flames of the proletarian revolution, the tsarist government mobilized all the forces of reaction and resorted to the counter-revolutionary dual tactics of using political and cultural repression and deception alternately against the revolutionary people. It was precisely during this reactionary historical period that the theory of the theatre which Stanislavsky knocked together — Stanislavsky's "system" — took shape. This shows it up unmistakably as a product of the tsarist government's reactionary policy of using culture to benumb the people.

The core of the "system", in Stanislavsky's own words, is "self". According

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *My Life in Art*, Chinese ed., New Literature and Art Publishing House, p. 556.

to him, all the obscurantism which he advocated, such as the "ruling idea" of a play, "through-action", "the germs of all the human vices and virtues" and "living human elements", reposed in the "innermost I".¹

For a long time, this bourgeois theatrical "system", disguised as socialist theatrical theory, was used by Khrushchov, Liu Shao-chi and company as a tool to counter Marxism-Leninism and work for the restoration of capitalism. This "system" swept from the Soviet Union to China, dominating the theatrical and cinema circles; nobody was allowed to say it nay. Every director and actor had to read Stanislavsky as his textbook and a virtual "Bible" for dramatic art. The slightest criticism of it would outrage those revisionist lords as if their ancestral graves had been desecrated. Chou Yang,

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 2, p. 281 and Vol. 4, p. 161.

Liu Shao-chi's agent in art and literary circles, screamed: "Stanislavsky's 'system' is the only system in the world history of the theatre. It must not be overthrown, nor can it be overthrown."¹

Is this so? Seen in its true colours, the "system" proves to be nothing but a paper tiger.

**SHOULD WE PROCEED FROM THE
WORKERS, PEASANTS AND SOLDIERS,
OR FROM "SELF"?**

The fundamental difference between the proletarian and the bourgeois concept of literature and art lies in whether to extol the workers, peasants and soldiers or to extol the bourgeoisie.

Stanislavsky said: "No matter what role an actor plays, he should always act

¹ Chou Yang's talk in Shenyang to the Liaoning literary and art circles, July 26, 1962.

out of himself";¹ "you must get it firmly into your head: The way to art is in yourself and only in yourself";² "play yourself all your life".³ Be it "himself" or "yourself", it refers to the inner being of the exploiting classes represented by Stanislavsky. His is a downright anti-Marxist concept which praises the bourgeoisie.

In class society, no individual exists in the abstract or above classes. Nor is there literature and art in the abstract or above classes. Let us trace the history of Stanislavsky's "performances" and we shall see out of what "self" he acted and what "self" he played "all his life".

During the fifty-one years between 1877 and 1928, he played 106 roles, all of them tsarist generals, aristocrats, bourgeois

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 357.

² C. S. Stanislavsky's *Talks*, Chinese ed., p. 87.

³ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 2, p. 280.

elements or certain strata of townspeople. During the fifty-seven years between 1881 and 1938, he directed eighty-five plays, the overwhelming majority of which were bourgeois "classics". Stanislavsky's so-called "acting out of himself" meant to act out of the political interests and the artistic requirements of the bourgeoisie. His so-called playing "self" meant playing and extolling the bourgeois "self". The stage theory based on such stage practice is bound to be replete with the characteristics of the life, personality and world outlook of the bourgeoisie, which are alien to the revolutionary theatre of the proletariat.

Can we proceed from the "self" of bourgeois intellectuals to portray the workers, peasants and soldiers? No. All the images of the workers, peasants and soldiers in proletarian art, such as Li Yu-ho in the model revolutionary Peking opera *The Red Lantern* and Yang Tzu-jung in the model revolutionary Peking opera

Taking the Bandits' Stronghold, are those of heroes and outstanding representatives of the proletariat. The excellent qualities they display are **"on a higher plane, more intense, more concentrated, more typical, nearer the ideal, and therefore more universal than actual everyday life"**. The process in which the actors study and portray these art images is one in which the actors understand, learn from and extol these heroic images and remould their own world outlook. Even actors of worker, peasant or soldier origin, without exception, must accept re-education. To stress that we should proceed from "self" to portray the workers, peasants and soldiers will only distort the revolutionary struggles of the workers, peasants and soldiers and their heroic mental outlook with the unbridled "self expression" of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. This is precisely the vicious method used by the capitalist roaders and reactionary art "authorities" who deliberately tried to

undermine the model revolutionary theatrical works by distorting and smearing the heroic images of the workers, peasants and soldiers. This method has already failed. Are there works of literature and art which proceed from the "self" of the bourgeoisie pretending to portray the workers, peasants and soldiers? Yes, who has not seen the plays and films produced under the rule of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique? In them the workers, peasants and soldiers are debased to an unbearable extent: some are cowards, some think only of raising a family, some have relations with White bandit officers, and some have still uglier stories... where are any of the qualities of the workers, peasants and soldiers? All are obviously shameless exposures of the Soviet revisionist renegade "self"!

Can this theory of proceeding from "self" be used in acting bourgeois parts or other negative roles? It won't do for

these either. From the proletarian point of view, villains like the bandit ring-leader, Eagle, in the Peking opera *Taking the Bandits' Stronghold*, and Hatoyama, chief of the Japanese military police, in *The Red Lantern*, can only be acted with the standpoint of the workers, peasants and soldiers, i.e., portrayed from the class hatred of the workers, peasants and soldiers to relentlessly expose and criticize the ugly, cruel and insidious class nature of these reactionaries, in order to bring the brilliant images of the proletarian heroes into bold relief. If one acts from Stanislavsky's bourgeois "self", then monsters of all kinds, which are to be overthrown and swept away in real life, will be made into major artistic parts, and will be allowed to exercise arrogant dictatorship over the workers, peasants and soldiers on the stage. Is there any such kind of drama? Yes, there is. The schools of the "art of experience" and "art of representation" which appeared in the

nineteenth century and developed into the "avant garde", "modernism", etc., in the imperialist and modern revisionist countries today are rubbish of this kind. In plain language, it means letting monsters and freaks of all sorts act the parts of monsters and freaks, letting bandits and letting rascals play themselves. Around 1962 under the domination of Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line and with the support and trickery of Peng Chen, Lu Ting-yi, Chou Yang, Hsia Yen, Tien Han and other counter-revolutionaries, there appeared in China many poisonous films including those depicting the so-called "middle characters" which are actually reactionary characters. In some of these films, counter-revolutionaries, landlords and bourgeois elements were played by real counter-revolutionaries, landlords and bourgeois elements. These bad elements were filmed in many close-ups showing their extremely reactionary, ugly and obscene nature. They

were given free rein to dominate the screen with their reactionary and corrupt "self".

In short, whether the revolutionary art workers play the positive roles of workers, peasants and soldiers or the negative roles, they must proceed from the revolutionary interests and revolutionary practice of the workers, peasants and soldiers. In the course of integrating themselves with the workers, peasants and soldiers, and of being re-educated by them, the revolutionary literary and art workers must distinguish what in their own minds belongs to bourgeois thinking and feelings from what reflects the life, thinking and feelings of the workers, peasants and soldiers. They must constantly overcome bourgeois self-interest and foster proletarian devotion to public interest. Only in this way can they really portray and create revolutionary images in art which can **"help the masses to propel history forward"**.

Stanislavsky's theory of "acting out of himself" is of the same cloth as the notorious theory of "projecting one's self" as put forward by Hu Feng, a counter-revolutionary winkled out from literary and art circles in China over ten years ago. Taking "I" as all-embracing and the centre of everything and doing whatever "I" like — this is the utterly egoistical aim in life of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. Imagination that proceeds from "self" means going in for personal gain and advancing at the expense of others; advocacy of "human love" out of "self" means subjecting the working people in their hundreds of millions forever to the miserable life of cold and hunger; to "embrace the world" from "self" is a synonym for fascist-imperialist acts of aggression. The reactionary literary and art slogan of proceeding from "self" put forward by Stanislavsky epitomized the decadent bourgeois individualism that the landlord class and the bourgeois-

sie used in literature and art to corrupt the masses so as to try to pump some life into the dying capitalist society. Stanislavsky fanatically tried to change the world by proceeding from "self" in the theatre. Was it not the dark kingdom full of exploitation, plunder and aggression that he sought after and defended?

In 1940, criticizing the comprador "men of letters" of the European-American school represented by Hu Shih, Chairman Mao pointed out:

The bourgeois die-hards are as hopelessly wrong on the question of culture as on that of political power. . . . Their starting point is bourgeois despotism, which in culture becomes the cultural despotism of the bourgeoisie. . . . They do not want the workers and the peasants to hold up their heads politically or culturally.

After the victory of the October Revolution, Stanislavsky went all out to oppose

presentation on the stage of the struggle and life of the workers, peasants and soldiers. He slanderously said that they were more interested "in seeing how other people live, in seeing a more beautiful life",¹ that is, the rotten life of the lords and ladies and their pampered sons and daughters which he presented on the stage. Stanislavsky's starting point — obstinately persisting in proceeding from "self" — is precisely the reactionary cultural despotism of the bourgeoisie which intends to make legitimate and eternal on the stage the "beautiful life" of the overthrown bourgeoisie, to prevent the workers, peasants and soldiers from holding up their heads politically and culturally, and to use the stage for a counter-revolutionary political come-back.

Chairman Mao has pointed out:

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 1, p. 437.

... All our literature and art are for the masses of the people, and in the first place for the workers, peasants and soldiers; they are created for the workers, peasants and soldiers and are for their use.

Literary and art workers must completely reject the reactionary viewpoint of proceeding from "self". Only by starting from the needs of the workers, peasants and soldiers and by integrating with them can literary and art workers create works that are really for them and for their use.

The splendid model revolutionary theatrical works created under the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, forcefully present, depict and praise the magnificent worker, peasant and soldier heroes. They are a sharp criticism of the reactionary theory of proceeding from "self". Today, stirring songs from the model revolutionary theatrical works are on lips everywhere in

China, a country with a quarter of the world population. Like evergreen pines, the images of the revolutionary heroes have taken deep root in the hearts of the revolutionary masses in their hundreds of millions and are inspiring their revolutionary fighting will.

THEORY OF CLASSES OR "THEORY OF GERMS"?

Nothing is more hypocritical than the efforts of the bourgeoisie to attribute their ugly world outlook to "mankind". Stanislavsky's theory of proceeding from "self" is built on this kind of hypocritical theoretical foundation.

Why should he proceed from "self"? He said: Everybody's "soul" originally has "the germs of all the human vices and virtues".¹ Therefore, the actor's "ruling

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 2, p. 281.

idea" is to find in the character he plays "the germs" which are kindred to his own soul and "to cultivate and develop these germs".¹

The "theory of germs" is the bourgeois theory of human nature. It puts up a show to counter the Marxist-Leninist theory on classes.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the existence of classes and of class struggle are the source of all phenomena in class society. The interests of the proletariat conform to the trend of historical development and to the fundamental interests of the working masses. Therefore, the proletariat is fearless and openly announces that its ideology has class character and Party spirit. The interests of the bourgeoisie, however, run counter to the trend of history and are diametrically opposed to the interests of the revolution-

¹ *Ibid.*

ary people. Hence they always try to cover up the class essence of their own ideology which they disguise as something transcending classes, something that belongs to "mankind", to the "entire people", so as to deceive the masses and perpetuate their ideological and cultural positions.

Seen in its true light, what "the germs of all the human vices and virtues" means is that all exploiting classes have on the surface the "germs" of humanity, justice and virtue on the one hand, and on the other hand the inherent "germs" of chasing profits and behaving like thieves and prostitutes. They keep both kinds of goods in stock and find a use for each. Aren't actors turned into hypocrites and double-dealers whose words and deeds differ if they "cultivate and develop" these two kinds of "germs" which are to be used alternately and in "organic co-ordination"? A notorious saying of Stanislavsky's that has spread its poison

widely runs: "Love art in yourself, and not yourself in art."¹ This is the best annotation for the philosophy of life of such hypocrites. "Love art in yourself" means to love the art that one uses as capital to obtain fame and to become an expert. This still means in essence to "love oneself". "Love not yourself in art" is no more than using "art for art's sake" as a cover-up to gain more capital to become famous and an expert. This is a subtle application to real life of his double-dealing "theory of germs". The bourgeois advocates of the theory of human nature, represented by Stanislavsky, hold that everybody is born with a dual nature of "human vices and virtues"; to say otherwise, they assert, runs counter to "human nature".

The model revolutionary theatrical works created by the revolutionary liter-

¹C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 3, p. 288.

ary and art workers under the leadership of Comrade Chiang Ching are the most effective criticism, through vivid imagery, of "the theory of human nature" which claims to transcend classes. The scene "Hatoyama Is Defied" in *The Red Lantern*, a model revolutionary Peking opera, successfully reflects through artistic imagery the struggle between the two world outlooks of the two classes. Hatoyama clamours that "the loftiest belief" is "for me", and "each for himself" in a vain effort to tempt Li Yu-ho with the bourgeois "secret of life". But to Communist Li Yu-ho, who works heart and soul for the public interest and devotes his life to the revolution, that is "too difficult for someone like me to understand". Confronted by the proletarian hero Li Yu-ho, "the loftiest belief" that Hatoyama brings up utterly fails. This also pronounces the dismal failure of the "ruling idea" on the stage touted by Stanislavsky. The reason for this is very simple: Bourgeois "na-

ture" and "germs" can never be found in the proletariat, nor can the fine qualities of the proletariat be found in the bourgeoisie.

But Stanislavsky did not stop here. On the basis of "the theory of germs", he went further to stress: "Never forget that when acting the villain you must look for those moments of his life when he was good, when his love was unselfish, when a spark of innocence still glimmered in his heart."¹ "When you act a good man, look to see where he is evil, and in an evil man, look to see where he is good,"² "etc".

Stanislavsky wanted to use "the theory of germs" to obliterate the differentiation between classes as well as the class struggle in real life. And it is precisely his applying it to the portrayal of all characters

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky's *Talks*, Chinese ed., p. 76.

² C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 1, pp. 144 and 145.

which exposed the reactionary nature of his "system".

According to this theory, in playing negative characters, such as Hatoyama, Eagle and their like, the actor should "look to see" where they are "good", "unselfish" and "innocent". The "system" insists on prettifying devils. Isn't this a "system" which speaks on behalf of imperialism and all reactionaries?

According to this theory, the actor playing proletarian heroes, like Li Yu-ho, Yang Tzu-jung, Kuo Chien-kuang (a company political instructor of the New Fourth Army in the model revolutionary Peking opera *Shachiapang*) and others, must "look to see where he is evil" so as to smear our revolutionary heroes. Isn't this a "system" which gives vent to deep hatred for the proletariat?

According to this theory, all exploiting classes in life become "kind-hearted" "good people" on the stage while all

working people become "hateful" "evil people". Isn't this a "system" which sings a hymn to the vicious system of exploitation?

According to this theory, there is no need for literary and art workers to be re-educated by the workers, peasants and soldiers. Do they have to remould themselves? No, not in the least, because they already have the "germs" of the workers, peasants and soldiers in their hearts. Moreover, if the bourgeois "germs" are lost in remoulding, then it is impossible to see "where he is evil" in the proletariat, or "where he is good" in the bourgeoisie. Look! Is this not a "system" which corrupts the intellectuals politically?

The counter-revolutionary advocacy of applying this theory to the portrayal of all characters has been used over and over again by the henchmen of modern revisionism in literature and art. This happened in the Soviet Union as well as in China. The renegade, hidden traitor and

scab Liu Shao-chi was presented as a "saviour" with a "halo" around his head. The vanquished generals of the Kuomintang, who were at the end of their rope, were played up as "heroes" having the manners of "cultured generals" and so on and so forth. Aren't such things a big exposure of the counter-revolutionary nature of these henchmen of modern revisionism in China?

The thunderclap of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution completely smashed Chou Yang's sinister line on literature and art as well as the counter-revolutionary "theory of germs" of Stanislavsky's "system". The noble and brilliant images of proletarian heroes and the ugly and worthless features of counter-revolutionaries on the model revolutionary theatrical works constitute a penetrating criticism of the "theory of germs". From now on when they depict the personalities of worker, peasant and soldier heroes, literary and art workers

must continue to struggle against their own non-proletarian thinking and accept re-education by the workers, peasants and soldiers and they must never allow the "germs" of the exploiting classes to appear to distort the images of heroic personalities.

TO MAKE PROPAGANDA CONSCIOUSLY OR "TO CREATE SUBCONSCIOUSLY"?

The decadence of bourgeois thinking and culture in the twentieth century is expressed not only in the touting of the "theory of human nature", but particularly in the naked publicity given to the anti-rational "subconscious".

According to Stanislavsky, "natural stimulation of creation of an organic nature and its subconsciousness" is "the essence of the whole system".¹

¹C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 2, p. 6.

What is the "subconscious"? It means that human activities are an expression of animal instincts. Did Stanislavsky invent this absurd theory? No, it was copied from the utterly debased and reactionary psycho-analytical school of Freud, and it showed that bourgeois theatrical art had reached the end of its line. The thinking of the bourgeoisie in this era has become so empty that the bourgeoisie can come up with nothing new theoretically, so they present themselves as wild beasts and allege that this ego of theirs is an animal "urge" that "everybody expresses". All this is to justify their reactionary class nature of exploitation, plunder and aggression. If there is any doubt, here are some examples.

See Stanislavsky's fantastic method at work:

"Look, your head is whirling. That's good."¹ "Your head is whirling at some

¹C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 373.

unexpected moments, there is a full merging of the life of the character you are depicting with your own life on the stage."¹ This is sheer nonsense! While acting on the stage, if "your head is whirling", won't you "whirl" away the dialogue and "the given circumstances"?

In fact, the heart of such remarks was to induce actors, under the pretext of laying stress on feelings and instincts and under the cover of "the mask", to display freely the decadent thinking in their hearts and unscrupulously show the rotten bourgeois way of life, and the more boldly and shamelessly the better. As Stanislavsky put it: "Under cover of the mask, he reveals intimate and secret instincts and aspects of his character that he dares not even speak of in real life."²

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 2, p. 438.

² C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 3, p. 264.

This theory has been the cause of countless shameless and degenerate acts on stage and behind the scenes, and it has seriously corrupted both the actors and the audience.

"Reason is dry,"¹ "in our theatrical art to understand means to feel."² This is advocating downright subjective idealism and anti-rationalism, that is, replacing the analysis of objective things with one's subjective imaginary bourgeois feelings, with the aim of distorting objective reality. Its spearhead is directed against the method of class analysis. At the same time, this theory of acting, which denies scientific rationalism and stresses the hysterical subconscious fully satisfies the needs of the well-fed and parasitic bourgeoisie who are given to sensuality and use every means to deny and cover up the realities of society and class struggle.

^{1, 2} C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 247.

Look at Stanislavsky's description of the rehearsal of a scene in the play *The Drama of Life* which he directed: "The actor tore passion to tatters, chewed the floor with emotion, and the stage director sat on him and beat him to encourage him."¹ Was this still a play? It was simply a herd of beasts that went mad on the stage.

With the dissemination of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought throughout the world and with the victories continuously won by the proletariat and the people in their revolutionary struggles, the bourgeoisie has long lost the courage to face reality. Instead of standing for the "rationalism" advocated in the early days of the bourgeois revolution, it has come to opposing and hating it. Subsequently, bourgeois culture and art have

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *My Life in Art*, Chinese ed., New Literature and Art Publishing House, p. 470.

passed from so-called realism into the blind alley of mysticism, impressionism and the "modernist" school of various descriptions. This is equally true of painting, music, the dance, drama and the cinema. Since Stanislavsky was a representative figure of the bourgeoisie in dramatic art, it was natural that he stubbornly tried to give expression to this characteristic of the bourgeoisie of this period. In fact, the "system" he worked out according to the formula: proceeding from "self"—"cultivating and developing" the "germs" of double-dealers—"subconscious creative work", is also a sort of "rationalism". But he never said that his stuff was "dry". Instead, he blew his own trumpet: "My system is for all nations."¹ Nevertheless, the "system" adored by the "ruined generation" is, in the eyes of the proletariat and revolu-

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 2, p. 497.

tionary people, not only "dry" but utterly exhausted, and is an indication that bourgeois literature and art have become completely exhausted spiritually, ideologically and artistically.

"Human nature cannot be changed"¹ and "don't constrain nature".² This reactionary viewpoint categorically denies that the world outlook of actors can be remoulded. It is, furthermore, a flagrant assertion that it is altogether unnecessary for actors to remould their world outlook. In the eyes of Stanislavsky and company, "everybody is for himself, and the devil take the hindmost", and egoism is human nature, an inborn "subconscious", which should be given free rein and should not be remoulded. This is open opposition to remoulding the world in the image of the proletariat.

¹ C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 1, p. 468.

² C. S. Stanislavsky, *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 529.

Nevertheless, the whole world is bound to be changed in accordance with the laws of struggle for transforming the world, laws pointed out by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. In the case of the intellectuals in general, who are divorced from the working people, we should guide them in integrating with and accepting re-education by the workers, peasants and soldiers so that they change their old ideology completely and the great majority gradually rid themselves of their bourgeois personality and foster proletarian thinking and feelings. There are indeed very few die-hards who "cannot be remoulded" or refuse to be remoulded. But that does not matter. They are also bound to change, that is, to become funerary objects for a dead bourgeois system.

Facts prove that the so-called "subconscious creative work" peddled by Stanislavsky is just trumpery. Different classes express clear-cut political aims in the

spheres of literature and art and always make conscious political propaganda. There has never been such a thing as "subconscious creative work". Whether it is revolutionary literature and art or counter-revolutionary literature and art — each embodies the world outlook of a particular class and serves its politics. In propagating "subconscious creative work", Stanislavsky was consciously trying to turn creative work completely into a "self" manifestation of the class instincts of the bourgeoisie, breaking the revolutionary fighting will of the masses of the people, sabotaging the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and opening the way for capitalism.

**STRENGTHEN THE DICTATORSHIP
OF THE PROLETARIAT ON THE
CULTURAL FRONT**

What theory of literature and art to propagate and what line to carry out in

literature and art is essentially a question of who exercises dictatorship, the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, a question of which class will transform the other. If the proletariat does not turn the theatre into a red revolutionary crucible, the bourgeoisie will change it into a black and stinking dyeing vat, disseminating the ideological poison of the bourgeoisie and contaminating the minds of the masses. The theatre would thus be turned into an effective weapon for restoring capitalism. The historical process of the "peaceful evolution" of the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union tells us that a bourgeois dictatorship in culture will inevitably lead to an all-round restoration of capitalism, politically and economically. Therefore, after its seizure of political power and even after the completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, if the proletariat does not launch a

great cultural revolution, what will ultimately be lost is not just leadership over culture, but the right of survival for the entire proletariat and the working people!

After profoundly summing up in good time the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country and studying the lessons of "peaceful evolution" in the Soviet Union, our great leader Chairman Mao clearly pointed out:

The proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the realm of the superstructure, including the various spheres of culture.

This great revolutionary programme is an important development of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat, pointing out the orientation for continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Exercising the dictatorship of the proletariat in the sphere of culture is, in the

final analysis, using Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to thoroughly criticize the ideology of all exploiting classes, completely liquidate the cultural capital which the bourgeoisie hopes to use to stage a come-back, and remould the world outlook of the intellectuals. At the same time, we must resolutely adhere to the orientation of serving the workers, peasants and soldiers, correctly evaluate the cultural legacy, implement Chairman Mao's principles "make the past serve the present and foreign things serve China" and "weed through the old to bring forth the new", and create a new culture of the proletariat.

Let us always hold high the great red banner of Mao Tsetung Thought and carry through to the end the revolution in the theatre and all other spheres of culture, and ensure that Chairman Mao's proletarian line in literature and art and the proletarian new revolutionary litera-

ture and art, with the model revolutionary theatrical works as their representatives, forever occupy the arena of culture!

(Originally published in
Hongqi, Nos. 6-7, 1969)

评斯坦尼斯拉夫斯基“体系”

上海革命大批判写作小组

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1969年（64开）第一版

编号：（英）10050-666

00014

10-E-1211Pc