

## RED FLAG VIEWS OPEN-DOOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Peking Domestic Service in Mandarin 2345 GMT 5 Feb 76 OW

[RED FLAG No 2 article by the CCP Committee of the Talian Institute of Chemistry and Physics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences: "It Is Fine To Conduct Scientific Research in an Open-Door Way"]

[Text] Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, our Talian Institute of Chemistry and Physics has vigorously developed its work and created an excellent situation by persistently taking the road of conducting scientific research in an open-door way and by constantly encouraging scientific and technical personnel to work together with workers and peasants. This has been done under the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line.

Our institute is now more than 60 years old. Therefore, it has many academic fields to cover and a large staff of scientific and technical personnel which has laid a firm foundation for scientific research work. Under the leadership of the party, it has since liberation done work for the country. But before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, as a result of interference and sabotage by Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line, the institute conducted scientific research behind closed doors for a long period of time, thus allowing some of its academic fields to be controlled by a few bourgeois intellectuals. Some people devotedly emphasized only individual interests without considering national interests. They were obsessed with the so-called free choices of research work in a deliberate effort to establish bases, with themselves at the center. Others glorified themselves by singing the praises of their own lives without paying any attention to what happened outside the windows of their homes. They were only interested in pursuing what they called the "theoretical system" behind closed doors. There were still others who corrupted young scientific and technical personnel with the bourgeois ideas of seeking personal fame and material gain. As a result, some individuals were forced to spend days and nights laying foundations for themselves as capital for their future advancement while only perfunctorily serving the public. Eventually, they slid down the erroneous road of struggle obsessed by bourgeois elements and thus caused scientific research work to deviate from socialist orientation.

The revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao was criticized during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and also during the movements to criticize Lin Biao and Confucius and to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. As a result of this criticism, we have realized that classes, class struggle and the danger of capitalist restoration still exist throughout the historical period of socialism. We have also realized that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the principal contradiction during this historical period. The scientific research units are by no means places where science is pursued for its own sake. Instead, they should be regarded as bases for combating and preventing revisionism and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the old society, science and technology were used to serve the rich and the property owners. Therefore, the old influence of bourgeois tradition, concepts, order and habits was deep-rooted in the scientific and technological field. The struggle between the two classes, roads and lines on the scientific and technological front became very acute as a result of interference and sabotage by Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line.

We must turn science and technology into an instrument for socialism and take them out of the hands of capitalism. Doing so requires us to wholeheartedly rely on the working class to take the bright socialist road of conducting scientific research in an open-door way. Only in this way can we end the monopoly of science and technology by a few people; gear scientific research work to better serve proletarian politics, workers, peasants and soldiers; integrate it with productive labor; and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in furthering socialist scientific tasks.

Over the past several years, we have opened scientific research facilities to workers, peasants and soldiers. The stress has been placed on practice in production when we went to join workers, peasants and soldiers in conducting research or invited them to our facilities. On the basis of actual conditions, we have on various occasions persistently integrated our work with practice in production and with the work of the masses of workers and peasants. Some of our projects have been selected to meet the needs of industrial and agricultural production and national defense construction under overall state planning and arrangement. We have also worked with workers, peasants and soldiers to formulate research plans, set and finalize technical measures, and develop research work. After achieving results in the laboratory, we have applied production projects in coordination with the masses of workers and peasants at the units concerned. Some small detachments have been sent by our institute to the frontline of production to work with the masses there in order to overcome difficult problems. We have also set up service departments to help units concerned solve some urgent problems in production. Furthermore, we have invited workers inside and outside our institute to conduct research in our research rooms.

In 1975, our institute established ties with more than 300 units in 27 provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities throughout our country. We have sent more than 500 persons to and invited more than 200 persons from these units. Our research projects encompass industry, agriculture, national defense, foreign aid, outer space and underwater. Our institute has formed a three-in-one combination group of workers, cadres and scientific and technical personnel, and has integrated scientific research, production and application into a single process. This has allowed the institute's personnel to develop great political enthusiasm, display great revolutionary vigor, and unite and coordinate with each other well in constantly achieving more and more gratifying results in scientific research. In 1973, the institute achieved 10 major results in scientific research; in 1974, 20 results. Of these, five reached the level of the world's advanced nations. In 1975, it achieved 28 major results, of which 12 reached the level of the world's advanced nations. For example, we have worked with personnel of the Peking general petrochemical plant and the (Shengli) chemical plant in producing within 6 months industrial devices to dispose of pollution caused by nitric oxide. We have also coordinated with plants and units concerned in successively overcoming in less than 2 years three problems arising from removing or purifying polluted water discharged by coke, dyestuffs and motion picture film production plants. We have found unique ways to solve these problems. Some results in this field are being tested by the industries concerned.

Our institute has successfully trial-produced a variety of new Chinese-type catalysts from domestic resources in coordination with the units concerned, thus blazing a trail for China to establish its own catalytic system.

Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, our institute has successfully trial-produced 144 new-type instruments which can be divided into 72 categories. Of these, 16 kinds of instruments, including chromatolytic instruments and earth surface surveying instruments, have been produced for promotion.

Practice has made us fully understand that the question of whether we are to conduct scientific research in an open-door way or behind closed doors is a fundamental distinction between a socialist scientific research institute and a capitalist scientific research institute. It is also an important aspect of the struggle between Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and the revisionist line on science and technology. Conducting scientific research in an open-door way is a socialist new thing; the emergence of which is an important achievement of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution; a profound socialist revolution on the scientific research front; and a necessary step in developing socialist science with greater, faster, better and more economical results.

Progress can be made only through struggle, but new struggles will result from progress. Our efforts to conduct scientific research in an open-door way have won active support from the departments of industrial and agricultural production and have been warmly welcomed and encouraged by the masses of workers and peasants. But these efforts have been attacked and criticized by some individuals in scientific and technological circles. They have openly alleged that conducting open-door scientific research in an institute is no good and that the reverse there are of such inventions the better. One of the reasons these individuals in scientific and technological circles oppose conducting open-door scientific research stems from the argument that since the directors are the center of the theatrical circles, researchers should be regarded as the center of any research institute.

According to this argument, only professional scientific and technological personnel can be confined to the towering buildings working with a small group of people. This argument also means that the broad masses of workers and peasants should still be barred from scientific research facilities because they are not qualified to take part in scientific research. Fundamentally, this argument actually runs counter to the historical materialist viewpoint "The people and the people alone are the motive force in making world history." The working people are the creators of material as well as spiritual wealth. In our socialist country under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers are the main force in the class struggle and the struggle for production and scientific experiment. They have played and will continue to play an increasingly important role in developing science and technology. No progress can possibly be made in science and technology without the participation of the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, and without the contributions of their rich practical experience. It is clear that the claim that researchers are the center of scientific research reflects an effort to uphold the idealist conception of history on behalf of the bourgeoisie.

Chairman Mao taught us: "Without integrating themselves with workers, peasants and the masses, the intellectuals will achieve nothing" and "to a certain extent, the wisest and most talented fighters are those having the richest practical experience." To conduct scientific research in an open-door manner it is politically necessary for scientific and technical personnel to remold their world outlook by receiving reeducation from workers, peasants and soldiers.

It is also academically necessary for them to restudy so that they can integrate their book knowledge with production, remold their former slavish outlook of being afraid to do what Westerners have not done, afraid to change what Westerners have established and even afraid to believe that they have outdone Westerners, and enhance our country's scientific study so that it may catch up with and surpass the world level.

As a result of our persistent efforts in conducting scientific research in an open-door manner and taking the "three-in-one" combination road, all scientific and technical personnel were emancipated from their small circle and their laboratories. They began to get in touch with workers and peasants and to take part in practical work in the three great revolutionary movements. A profound change has taken place in their spiritual outlook. Studying works by Marx, Lenin and Chairman Mao, criticizing revisionism and conducting scientific research along with the workers, they have maintained a deep proletarian relationship with the latter. Now, some exemplary scientific and technical personnel can hardly be distinguished from common workers. Many workers have cordially said that they feel a warmth in their hearts at being able to work with such intellectuals. A number of scientific and technical personnel have also emotionally said that, in the past, they simply watched the workers work according to their plans, and that they now feel more down to earth by being able to join with workers in making plans and solving problems.

Conducting scientific research in an open-door manner has changed the old situation in which the institute was run by "experts" and researchers were the center. It has also enhanced scientific research. For example, our institute was once conducting a very important scientific research project. During the first 7 years, the project was conducted behind closed doors. Only the opinions of "experts" and ideas from books were followed. Progress was slow. During the 3-year period that followed, workers' opinions were invited and their efforts were used to solve problems. The project was thus expedited. Even the expert who had once been regarded as the center of the scientific project sighed that he had never realized the extent of the workers' revolutionary spirit in daring to think and act and their working speed.

The theory that "researchers are the center" pushed by some people in the scientific circle is nothing new. In 1957, when the bourgeois rightists were attacking the party, didn't they also clamor: "Let the experts run the institutes" and "let the professors run the universities?" Today, these reactionary fallacies have again been disseminated in a disguised form by certain people in scientific and technical circles. This fully shows that their bourgeois stand and their thinking are extremely stubborn. In opposing the running of the institute in an open-door manner, one of the reasons most loudly shouted by some people in scientific and technical circles has been that "the pressure generated from running the institute in an open-door manner would prevent people from engaging in theoretical research."

It seems that these people are most concerned only with the qualitative development of scientific theory, and that our efforts to conduct scientific research in an open-door manner will obstruct the development of scientific theory. This is nothing but a bourgeois prejudice. Engels pointed out that the generation and development of science are primarily determined by production. Chairman Mao has also taught us that truth can be discovered through practice and truth can be proven and developed through practice.

The production struggle is the source of natural scientific theory and it is the criterion for examining scientific truth. The history of the development of the natural sciences shows us that scientific theories are generated on the basis of the production struggle and that they can only be developed on this basis. Without the production struggle, development of scientific theories is not possible.

Engels said that once society has a technical need, this need will prompt universities to further scientific study. In conducting scientific research in an open-door manner-- wherein the scientific and technical staff integrates with workers and peasants, and scientific research is integrated with production and theory is integrated with practice-- scientific and technical personnel will be able to understand many things concerning industrial and agricultural production and national defense construction and they can see the pressing needs of workers, peasants and soldiers in making technical innovations and technical transformations. This will spur them to work hard together with workers, peasants and soldiers to enhance the scientific standard and to create favorable conditions for the development of natural science theory. How can conducting scientific research in an open-door manner be put in opposition to theoretical study since conducting scientific research in an open-door manner is a powerful motive force in spurring the development of scientific theory?

If there is "pressure" generated by conducting scientific research in an open-door manner, it only exists for the handful of bourgeois-thinking people because they are completely preoccupied with the idea of conducting pedantic and mythical theoretical study and are unwilling to take the road of integrating themselves with workers and peasants. This "pressure" on them is anything but bad because it compels them to join the workers and peasants in order to combine their theory with practice and to contribute to the development of socialist sciences.

For example, take the scientific and technical personnel of the No 203 group of our institute's second research room. Because of their work in three factories and their participation in production, their research project on (?basic hydrocarbon) high power catalytic polymerization was successful in only 1 year, as compared with the same type of catalyst produced by foreign countries, its effect is 20 times greater. While solving practical production problems they have also compiled and analyzed large quantities of first-hand materials and data by discarding the extraneous and selecting the essential, eliminating the false and retaining the true, and proceeding from the one to the other and from the outside to the inside. In this way they have produced by inference a formula for determining the effects of (?hydrocarbon) on the molecular weight of polymerized substances, found the law of the deterioration of activity of two kinds of catalytic agents, studied the relationship between catalysts' activity and [words indistinct] developed the catalytic theory and achieved initial success in discovering, inventing, creating and advancing. This fully shows that conducting scientific research in an open-door manner is in complete accord with the line of thought in dialectical materialism and has paved a broad way for the study of scientific theory.

Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, our institute has written 487 theses and academic reports. Nearly 100 have been published in national scientific and technical journals. A number of scientific and technical reports on (?weather forecasts) have also been published. Facts have powerfully rebuffed those who oppose conducting scientific research in an open-door manner.

The production struggle is the source of natural scientific theory and it is the criterion for examining scientific truth. The history of the development of the natural sciences shows us that scientific theories are generated on the basis of the production struggle and that they can only be developed on this basis. Without the production struggle, development of scientific theories is not possible.

Engels said that once society has a technical need, this need will prompt universities to further scientific study. In conducting scientific research in an open-door manner-- wherein the scientific and technical staff integrates with workers and peasants, and scientific research is integrated with production and theory is integrated with practice-- scientific and technical personnel will be able to understand many things concerning industrial and agricultural production and national defense construction and they can see the pressing needs of workers, peasants and soldiers in making technical innovations and technical transformations. This will spur them to work hard together with workers, peasants and soldiers to enhance the scientific standard and to create favorable conditions for the development of natural science theory. How can conducting scientific research in an open-door manner be put in opposition to theoretical study since conducting scientific research in an open-door manner is a powerful motive force in spurring the development of scientific theory?

If there is "pressure" generated by conducting scientific research in an open-door manner, it only exists for the handful of bourgeois-thinking people because they are completely preoccupied with the idea of conducting pedantic and mythical theoretical study and are unwilling to take the road of integrating themselves with workers and peasants. This "pressure" on them is anything but bad because it compels them to join the workers and peasants in order to combine their theory with practice and to contribute to the development of socialist sciences.

For example, take the scientific and technical personnel of the No 203 group of our institute's second research room. Because of their work in three factories and their participation in production, their research project on (?basic hydrocarbon) high power catalytic polymerization was successful in only 1 year, as compared with the same type of catalyst produced by foreign countries, its effect is 20 times greater. While solving practical production problems they have also compiled and analyzed large quantities of first-hand materials and data by discarding the extraneous and selecting the essential, eliminating the false and retaining the true, and proceeding from the one to the other and from the outside to the inside. In this way they have produced by inference a formula for determining the effects of (?hydrocarbon) on the molecular weight of polymerized substances, found the law of the deterioration of activity of two kinds of catalytic agents, studied the relationship between catalysts' activity and [words indistinct] developed the catalytic theory and achieved initial success in discovering, inventing, creating and advancing. This fully shows that conducting scientific research in an open-door manner is in complete accord with the line of thought in dialectical materialism and has paved a broad way for the study of scientific theory.

Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, our institute has written 487 theses and academic reports. Nearly 100 have been published in national scientific and technical journals. A number of scientific and technical reports on (?weather forecasts) have also been published. Facts have powerfully rebuffed those who oppose conducting scientific research in an open-door manner.

It was designed to oppose the socialist road in conducting scientific research in an open-door way and to pull our scientific research back to the old road of revisionism. This shows that these persons are indeed very advanced in practicing revisionism but not interested in practicing socialism.

Why do these people in the science and technology circles oppose conducting scientific research in an open-door way? They have said: "Do not mention the dictatorship of the proletariat on the science and technology front!" This means that they oppose the fulfillment of the task of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat in the field of science and technology. The proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure, including all spheres of culture. Conducting scientific research in an open-door way is conducive to strengthening the working class leadership over scientific research, to integrating scientific and technical personnel with workers and peasants, to restricting bourgeois rights, and to narrowing the difference between mental and physical labor. It is also conducive to making our scientific research work serve proletarian politics and industrial and agricultural production as well as our national defense. In a nutshell, it is conducive to strengthening and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The courage of some people in science and technology circles is indeed extremely little. In his criticism of the Philistines of the Socialist Democratic Party, Engels once pointed out: They were so scared that they shouted for help upon hearing the term "dictatorship of the proletariat." This is why these people in science and technology circles have now gone to such desperate lengths to attack and oppose the road of conducting scientific research in an open-door way. Their attempt is aimed at eliminating the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie in the field of science and technology. In view of the above, this attempt is not surprising.

The struggle on the science and technology front is by no means accidental. This is a reflection of the struggle between the two classes, roads, and lines during the period of socialism; a reflection of this struggle on the science and technology front. Like that in the education circles, a right deviationist wind to reverse prior verdicts was fanned in the field of science and technology during a certain period. But this wind cannot obstruct the surging revolutionary current.

"Nothing is hard in this world if you dare to scale the heights." We must take class struggle as the key link, adhere to the party's basic line, unwaveringly lead our scientific and technical personnel to integrate themselves with workers and peasants and take the road of conducting scientific research in an open-door way, and strive to run our socialist scientific research institute well and to scale the heights in science and technology.

#### PEKING STRESSES NEW APPROACH TO HISTORY

Peking Domestic Service in Mandarin 2230 GMT 7 Feb 76 CW

[PEOPLE'S DAILY 3 February correspondent's and reporter's report: "The Present Is Better Than the Past on the Education Front"]

[Summary] "For more than 2 months, the general party branch of the History Department of Peking University, under the leadership of the university party committee, has taken class struggle as the key link and broadly mobilized the masses to conduct a revolutionary mass debate in order to check the right deviationist wind which attempts to reverse previous verdicts.

From the viewpoint of class struggle and using the method of class analysis, teachers and students of the History Department have analyzed the absurd arguments in the education and scientific-technical fields and have come to understand that they are the sharp expression of the revisionist line, signifying the bourgeoisie's opposition to the proletariat. Those who concoct the farrago rave that the present is not as good as the past and negate the gains of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the revolution in education. They want to settle accounts with the Cultural Revolution and reverse the correct decisions already made in the Cultural Revolution. In the final analysis, they vainly attempt to change the party's basic line, subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism."

The vast number of teachers and students have deeply criticized the right deviationist farrago which attempts to reverse previous verdicts by contrasting the changes which took place in the History Department after the Cultural Revolution with the previous situation. Before the Cultural Revolution, the History Department of Peking University was the bourgeois intellectuals' unified kingdom. At that time, it discriminated against the sons and daughters of workers and peasants by holding the banner "stress is put exclusively on getting good marks" and admitted only the offspring of the landlord and capitalist classes. This was a serious indication of the bourgeoisie's dictatorship over the proletariat.

"Today, the working class exercises leadership over the school and admits students from among the workers, peasants and soldiers who have had practical experience, thus again reversing the class line already reversed in the past. Those who concoct the farrago on the education front oppose the admission of students from among the workers, peasants and soldiers who have had practical experience and oppose the workers, peasants and soldiers studying, managing and reforming the schools in a vain attempt to oppose Chairman Mao's 21 July directive and to let the bourgeoisie again exercise dictatorship over the proletariat. We must never allow this to happen.

"In the mass debate, the teachers and students of the History Department have also said: Many students of the History Department of the old Peking University, not being tempered in the three great revolutionary movements, were easily influenced by feudalist, capitalist and revisionist ideas and induced to confine themselves to a little tower of intellectual aristocrats. After studying for a few years, they became physical wrecks always concerned about personal position and gain and had a bourgeois world outlook." The students of today's History Department, consistently putting proletarian politics in command, have conscientiously participated in the revolution. In the course of studying, they have compiled teaching materials, run short-term training classes and taken part in research in historical science and compilation of history books together with their teachers.

"The content of the teaching material in the History Department of the old Peking University was full of feudalist, capitalist and revisionist poison. Today, the History Department devotes its efforts to the study of the practical issues of the Chinese revolution and, under the guidance of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, deepens revolutionary mass criticism in the courses of study and strives hard to occupy the sphere of courses of study with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. As a result, the content of teaching has undergone great changes. It now stresses criticizing the concept that heroes create history, expounding the working people's position and role in history, criticizing worship of the Confucian school and opposition to the Legalist school, and using the Marxist viewpoint to correctly evaluate the Confucian-Legalist struggle.



"It also stresses the criticism of paying more attention to the past than to the present and worshipping anything foreign and belittling anything Chinese. It summarizes the historical experience of class struggle and serves proletarian politics.

"Since 1970, the History Department has compiled over 30 kinds of new teaching material and published 19 history books, plus 12 about to be published. These achievements have exceeded the total efforts made during the 17 years prior to the Cultural Revolution." At present, the History Department of Peking University is deepening its mass debate on the revolution in education. Teachers and students are determined to triumph in the struggle against the right deviationist wind to reverse previous verdicts.

#### PEKING PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT PROMOTES DEBATE

Peking NCNA Domestic Service in Chinese 1525 GMT 5 Feb 76 CW

[Summary] Peking, 5 February 1976--Teachers and students of the Department of Philosophy of Peking University have promoted the great debate on the education revolution by using dialectical materialism and historical materialism to criticize the preposterous revisionist arguments on the education front.

After the deepening of the great debate on the education revolution, worker-peasant-soldier students of the Department of Philosophy of Peking University wrote a big-character poster: "Discussion of Dialectics With Those Who Concocted the Preposterous Arguments," which pointed out the political error and theoretical absurdity of the preposterous arguments. Their criticism has won the resolute support of the department's general part branch. "Through struggle, the teachers and students have come to realize that in order to penetratingly criticize the revisionist political line it is necessary to study Marxist philosophy and apply it in criticizing the revisionist ideological line and the tricks of eclecticism frequently employed by those who concocted the preposterous arguments.

"Led by the Peking University CCP Committee, the general party branch of the Department of Philosophy organized the teachers and students of the first-year, second-year, third-year and short-term training classes to study philosophical works by proletarian revolutionary teachers while studying the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Some of the philosophical works studied were 'Ludwing Feuerback and the End of Classical German Philosophy,' 'Anti-Deuhring,' 'Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,' 'On Practice,' 'On Contrdiction' and 'On the Correct Handling of Contrdictions among the people.' From the viewpoint of dialectical and historical materialism, the teachers and students analyzed the theoretical basis of the preposterous revisionist arguments on the education front and criticized idelist apriorism, the theory of productive forces and the theory of the dying out of class struggle which oppose the party's basic line; the metaphysical viewpoint that 'heaven has not changed and therefore the ways should not be changed' which opposes socialist new things; the doctrine of the mean and eclecticism which oppose the Marxist philosophy of struggle; and the reactionary idealist concept of history which opposes the view that the masses are the makers of history."

Students of the first-year class of the Department of Philosophy wrote a big-character poster criticizing those who oppose the revolution in education. The students noted: