

Jason

DS

701

H931+

JPRS: 36,059

TT: 66-32493

20 June 1966

TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNG-CH'I (RED FLAG)

No. 7, 1966

- Communist China -

No. 29

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

Building Tempo E

Adams Drive, 4th and 6th Streets, S.W.

Washington, D.C. 20443

Price: \$1.00

FOREWORD

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF JPRS REPORTS

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

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

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

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

TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNG-CH'I (RED FLAG)

No. 7, 1966

- Communist China -

No. 29

THE STANDPOINT OF WHICH CLASS DO THE EDITORIAL
DEPARTMENTS OF CH'IEN-HSIEN AND PEKING JIH-PAO TAKE?

[Following is a translation of an article by Ch'i Pen-yu (2058 2609 4416) in the Chinese-language periodical, Hung-ch'i (Red Flag), Peiping, No 7, 1966.]

On April 16 this year, the Peking Jih-pao allotted three full pages for publishing under banner headlines materials criticizing the Three-Family Village and the Night Causerie at Yenshan. The Ch'ien-hsien magazine of the CCP Peking Municipal Committee and the Peking Jih-pao each added an "editor's note" to such data. The Peking Wan-pao of that date also allotted more than three pages for publishing selected data from these materials. This majestic display was seldom seen since the founding of these publications.

Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao published a profusion of poisonous weeds against the Party and socialism in the past. Now before they can criticize these numerous poisonous weeds in real earnest, they must and should be stern in making a self-criticism of their own mistakes. By taking the present course of action, however, are the Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao criticizing the poisonous weeds in real seriousness? Are they sternly criticizing themselves? No, not at all.

Have you criticized Wu Han?

You have not.

Since Wu Han used Hai Jui as a subject matter to launch a rabid attack against the Party and socialism in 1959, up to November 10, 1965, when Comrade Yao Wen-yuan published the article, "On the New

Historical Play Hai Jui Relieved of His Office," more than six years had elapsed. During this period of more than six years, Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao published not a word to expose Wu Han. On the contrary, during the period in question, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao energetically published articles to give warm support to Wu Han and the anti-Party, anti-socialist "Hai Jui" modeled by him. Among all articles eulogizing the Hai Jui Relieved of His Office, the wonderful articles "carefully written" by the group of "old brothers" are the worst examples.

After Comrade Yao Wen-yüan brought forward the question of Wu Han, have you changed your attitude? You also have not. For nearly twenty days, you did not reproduce or make any mention of so important a militant article. On the other hand, you questioned the comrades in Shanghai: "What is the background, if any, for you to publish Yao Wen-yüan's article? Why have you not informed us in advance? Where is your Party spirit?"

What is the background? The background is the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the theory of class and class contradiction in socialist society which Comrade Mao Tse-tung has constantly taught us, the decision on launching throughout the country the struggle for the promotion of proletarian ideas and the destruction of bourgeois ones in the communique of the 10th Plenum of the 8th CCP Central Committee -- which your papers have also carried. Can it be said that the carrying out of class struggle must have your approval? Can it be said that anything which you have not approved is devoid of Party spirit? It is very clear that such Party spirit is not that of the proletariat but that of the bourgeoisie.

On November 29, 1965, under the pressure of the masses, the Peking Jih-pao was forced to reproduce Comrade Yao Wen-yüan's article. Had your attitude been changed at that time? Also not. The Chieh-fang-chün Pao published a clearly-worded "editor's note" which correctly pointed out that Wu Han's Hai Jui Relieved of His Office was a big poisonous weed. But the "editor's note" of the Peking Jih-pao neither said that the play, Hai Jui Relieved of His Office, was right nor said that it was wrong. It only said that this was a "play of greater influence," that people "held different views" in the past few years, and that "the different views should be discussed." As a matter of fact, you supported Wu Han and were opposed to Comrade Yao Wen-yüan's article. Both Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Wan-pao did not reproduce Comrade Yao Wen-yüan's article, and only Peking Jih-pao came forward to reproduce it. You just falsely assumed an impartial look to cover up your genuine biased attitude.

On December 12, 1965, Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao suddenly devoted prominent space to publish under bold headlines an article signed by Hsiang Yang-sheng. The title of this article was "From Hai Jui Relieved of His Office to 'The Theory of Moral Inheritance'." You seemed to have rectified your own mistake and stepped over to the front of socialist cultural revolution.

What is this meant?

Now, this article is one that dances to a tune opposed to the cultural revolution. It adopts the tactic of "abusing a person in a small way and helping him in a big way" to come to the defense of Wu Han. The focal view of the article seeks to turn the "guiding thought" of Wu Han's Hai Jui Relieved of His Office into a question of "moral inheritance." In Hsiang Yang-sheng's article an important political problem which is anti-Party and anti-socialist has thus been transformed into a so-called "pure academic" problem.

The author of this article also defends Wu Han with the bourgeois slogan that "everyone is equal before truth." As a matter of fact, you have always been taking the bourgeois stand to shelter the representative characters of the bourgeoisie -- such as Wu Han -- and to suppress the proletarian revolutionaries. You have always given the green light to reactionary things and allowed the release of a profusion of anti-Party and anti-socialist poisonous weeds, but have held back and refused to publish all articles criticizing the poisonous weeds. This is simon-pure bourgeois "liberalism" and the practice of simon-pure dictatorship over the proletariat. Where is equality?

At the end of his article Hsiang Yang-sheng also genteely call on all people to discuss what is called the question of "moral inheritance" in an attempt to set the tune for discussing problems in Wu Han's Hai Jui Relieved of His Office, and to swing the criticism of that play from acute political problems to so-called "pure academic" problems. Later, people have learned that Hsiang Yang-sheng is also Teng T'o who has written anti-Party and anti-socialist articles in association with Wu Han. What is even more serious is that at a meeting of the Peking Jih-pao held on December 2, 1965, Teng T'o openly declared that "up to now, Hai Jui Relieved of His Office has not been affirmed as a big poisonous weed." He also said that there were mistakes both in Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's article and Wu Han's articles.

Not long after this, that is, on December 27, 1965, the Peking Jih-pao published Wu Han's "Self-Criticism on Hai Jui Relieved of His Office." This is a phony apologie but is actually an article which presses on with the attack. The Peking Jih-pao published this article without any comment or criticism. In point of fact, the counterattack launched by Wu Han in the form of self-examination against the comrades criticizing him was backed by the paper. What is worthy of note is that in this article Wu Han implies to tell Hsiang Yang-sheng: Your criticism "has enabled me to see my mistakes and rectify my own point of view." After accomplishing the task of launching a counterattack, Wu Han published, according to the tune set by Hsiang Yang-sheng, his so-called self-criticism on the question of "moral inheritance" in Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao. He gladly admitted that the "focus" of his own mistakes was what was called the question of "moral inheritance." The two were thus closely associated to play a duet together.

One article alone was not enough to set the tune. So you followed this up with a series of articles and made a vigorous attempt to modify Wu Han's anti-Party and anti-socialist political problems as so-called "pure academic problems." The article, "On Comrade Wu Han's Historical Outlook" by Li Tung-shih, i.e., Li Ch'i, Director of the Propaganda Department of the CCP Peking Municipal Committee) was published in the January 8, 1966 issue of the Peking Jih-pao with this end in view. This article describes the "guiding thought" of Wu Han's Hai Jui Relieved of His Office as a view point adopted for the evaluation of historical characters. The same Hai Jui Relieved of His Office is thus a product of the so-called "theory of moral inheritance" at one time and a product of the viewpoint adopted for the evaluation of historical characters in another while, but is never described as an anti-Party and anti-socialist product.

It won't do for one to indulge oneself in the malpractice of feathering one's nest in the face of the world. The Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao's tactics -- of pretending to expose Wu Han but actually supporting him, pretending to criticize him but actually sheltering him, pretending to wage a struggle against him but actually protecting him -- have been quickly unmasked by the public. Many newspapers and magazines have published articles to expose the anti-Party and anti-socialist activities of Wu Han. Especially since April this year, Wu Han's anti-Party and anti-socialist crimes have become more and more well known to people, and the features of an anti-communist, anti-people and counter-revolutionary intellectual have been more and more clearly exposed.

The Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao which shelter Wu Han have found themselves confronted by the embarrassing announcement of "check." Therefore, you have come forward with a wry face and said that "Wu Han is the author of these two big poisonous weeds -- 'Hai Jui Abuses the Emperor' and Hai Jui Relieved of His Office." You have also published once again the article, "Chao Kua and Ma Shu" which Wu Han published in the Ch'ien-hsien in the past in the hope of muddling through and defrauding the readers. This is your so-called "criticism" of Wu Han. People cannot help from asking: Why is it that you publicize things which are known to everybody as though they are top secret things, but refuse to say even one word about Wu Han's various criminal activities -- his inheriting the mantle of Hu Shih, his willingness to serve as a lackey of the United States and his scheming and plotting for the Kuomin-tang reactionaries?

Have you ever criticized Liao Mo-sha?

You have not.

Liao Mo-sha (formerly Director of the United Front Department of the CCP Peking Municipal Committee) was the person who in those years attacked Lu Hsun, the leader of the cultural revolution, with vicious words and was described as affixing a different name on the secret arrow. (In 1943, Liao Mo-sha used the pen-name of "Lin Mo" to publish in the Ta Wan-pao an article called "On 'Laced Literature'" which attacked Lu Hsun's revolutionary satirical essays as "laced literature." Lu Hsun made this statement to retort Liao Mo-sha and named his own collection of satirical essays Laced Literature. (See Collected Works of Lu Hsun, Vol. V, People's Literature Publishing House, 1957 edition, pp. 341, 397-400). Now he again uses the same tactic to shoot secret arrows at the Party and the people. May we ask Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao: When have you ever criticized such a person?

The rotten poisonous weeds have been described by Liao Mo-sha as lovely flowers. He thinks that the anti-Party and anti-socialist Hai Jui Relieved of His Office is very good and "another such play ought to be written." He thinks that the anti-Party and anti-socialist Li Hui-niang has "done no harm in portraying ghosts" and "can inspire people's fighting spirit." When have you ever criticized such works which aid and abet the counter-current of Right opportunism or revisionism and have spread a lot of poison in society?

You know very well that the Stories of Not Fearing Ghosts has been published for the purpose of inspiring the Chinese people to wage a struggle against imperialism, revisionism and all reactionaries, but you have contrived to play the opposite show and published in Ch'ien-hsien Liao Mo-sha's "'Elegant Jokes' of Fearing Ghosts" which maliciously attacks and slurs our great Party and great people as "mean and foolish," "indulging themselves in tall talk," "acting with no regard for consequences," and "people who say they do not fear ghosts but are actually scared to death." Will you please tell us what are you driving at in publishing such an article? At what time have the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people shown any fear of the ghosts? Are you not slurring the great Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people exactly in the same way as imperialism, revisionism and the reactionaries of various countries?

On May 6, 1963, Comrade Liang Pi-hui (i.e., Yu Ming-huang) published in the Wen-hui Pao his article, "About It Is Harmless to Have Ghosts." Following this, other newspapers and periodicals also joined the criticism. But up to that time you still refused to publish the articles criticizing him [Liao Mo-sha]. Later, seeing that there was really no way to shun the issue, you had no alternative but to help Liao Mo-sha publish a half-hearted phoney apologia for defrauding the masses -- "My 'Theory That It Is Harmless to Have Ghosts' Is Wrong." He affixed to himself a number of breezy labels -- such as "I have forgotten" "the class struggle," "I have lost my vigilance," "I have not drawn a clear line of demarcation," "I have lost my direction," "I have unconsciously helped the bourgeoisie and the feudal forces launch a rabid attack against the Party and socialism" -- as though he means business.

Such a phoney apologia could not of course defraud the masses. The reading public sternly criticized this phony apologia, but neither Ch'ien-hsien, nor Peking Jih-pao, nor Peking Wan-pao paid any attention to such proper criticism of the masses. This is because, as far as you are concerned, Liao Mo-sha must be well protected and no concession can be made on the anti-Party and anti-socialist ground.

On April 16, this year, the "editor's notes" of Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao seemed to have changed their past tune and said: "He (referring to Liao Mo-sha) is definitely not one who 'has unconsciously helped the bourgeoisie and the feudal forces launch a rabid attack against the Party and socialism,' but is a leading general who is consciously opposed to the Party, socialism and the

thought of Mao Tse-tung." However, this is still a label devoid of substance. We want to ask: what is this Liao Mo-sha doing? From his series of reactionary utterances and deeds, it is entirely possible to see that he is a representative character of the bourgeoisie who has sneaked into the Party -- a representative character of the bourgeoisie working for the "ghosts," for imperialism, revisionism and the reactionaries of various countries, and for the landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, undesirable characters and rightists; a representative character of the bourgeoisie who has joined forces with the foreign and domestic ghosts to form a united front against communism, the people and the revolution. Since you have a much better knowledge of his reactionary activities than us, why is it that you have refused to expose any of them? As things indicate, up to now you are still possessed by the "ghosts."

Have you ever criticized Ten T'o?

You also have not.

Several years ago, the Right opportunists who represent the forces for restoring capitalism, that is, the revisionists, swept up a countercurrent in the surging tide of socialist revolution. They made use of our temporary difficulties to launch a rabid attack, against the Party and socialism. Teng T'o was an important figure in this rabid attack. He was the organizer and leader of the anti-Party faction called "Three-Family Village" comprising Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and Teng T'o. We know that it was this Teng T'o who personally invited Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha to dinner in a restaurant in September, 1961, to organize this anti-Party and anti-socialist shady inn. It was he who gave the present name to this shady inn, fixed the pseudonym of Wu Nan-hsing, and decided what articles should be published. The history of the founding of the "Three-Family Village" is the history of Teng T'o leading Wu Han, Liao-Mo-sha and a number of anti-Party and anti-socialist representative characters of the bourgeoisie to wage a sharp class struggle against the proletariat on the cultural and ideological front.

What kind of a person is Teng T'o? It has now been found that he is a renegade. He sneaked into the Party during the period of war of resistance against Japan. He disguised himself as an activist to win the confidence of the Party and the people, and held an important post in Jen-min Jih-pao. He constantly made use of his duties and powers to distort Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung, and to popularize and publicize his bourgeois

revisionist ideas. In the summer of 1957 he was a figure who waved the feather fan on the side of the Right opportunists. He published many rightist articles which were anti-Party and anti-socialist, and the article called "Abolish 'Vulgar Politics'" in the May 11, 1957 issue of the Jen-min Jih-pao was written by him under the pseudonym Pu Wu-chi. This article made a vicious attack against the Party and called on the Party to hand over the leadership to the bourgeois right-wingers. Apart from this, he also gave active support to the right-wingers who rabidly attacked the Party. A rightist called Lin Hsi-ling is his most intimate friend. Lin once called Teng T'o "the unorthodox Marxist-Leninist" of China. This means to say that even the bourgeois right-wingers have long ago known that he is a revisionist. With the struggle against the rightists ended in victory, Teng T'o's dream of restoring capitalism failed to realize. He was removed from the Jen-min Jih-pao by the CCP Central Committee. He was "relieved" of his "office" by the people. Not long after this, he made his way into the CCP Peking Municipal Committee. He ascended the stage once again and served as a Secretary in the Secretariat of the CCP Peking Municipal Committee.

Teng T'o has "a good knowledge" of some struggle strategy. Because of the stormy anti-rightist movement in 1957, he has changed his mode of struggle. He was still frightened by the scene of struggle in which the rightists were criticized by the broad masses in the anti-rightist movement. Under the situation of the new class struggle, he no longer went into battle with bare shoulders and made rightist utterances like he did in 1957, but adopted even more treacherous and sly methods to wage a struggle against us. He used Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao as his battleground, and adopted the methods of making veiled criticism of contemporary people with ancient characters and pointing his accusing finger at a mulberry tree to abuse an ash tree, he continuously shot one poisonous arrow after another at the Party and socialism. Among them the most notorious ones are "A Fortune Based upon an Egg," "Stories of Telling Lies," "Two Fables from Other Countries," "Three Kinds of Chu-ko Liang," "Big Talk," "Plant Your Feet on Solid Ground," "Theory of Taking Good Care of the Labor Force," "Way to Make Friends and to Receive Guests," "The Cases of Ch'en Chiang and Wang Keng," "In Defense of Li Sant's'ai," "People of the Kunlun Mountains," "Senior and Junior Mi of Wan'ing," "Cheng Pan-ch'ao and the Pan-ch'iao Style," "Are Clever Ideas Dependable?" "Rule of Right and Rule of Might," "Wise After the Event," "Cartoons of Old Times," "Death of Lin Pai-shui," and "Special Treatment for 'Amnesia'."

Have Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao ever criticized in the past these tactics of making veiled criticism of contemporary people with ancient characters and those poisonous weeds which viciously attack the Party and socialism? No, they have not made a wee bit of criticism.

The extremely reactionary article, "Special Treatment for 'Amnesia'," is especially a vicious dart shot directly at our respected and beloved CCP Central Committee. He outrageously attacks our respected and beloved Party. He wants to pour "dog's blood" over our "heads," and hit our "heads" with a stick specially made in a foreign country until we suffer from "shock" so that those so-called "exalted doctors" of theirs -- that is, a handful of revisionists -- may ascend the stage. This frantically counter-revolutionary satirical essay has fully exposed how Teng T'o and his gang of anti-Party and anti-socialist revisionists hate the Party and the people to the bone.

Teng T'o's outrageous deportment against the Party and socialism aroused the indignation of the broad masses of the reading public. They wrote letters to Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao to voice their stern criticisms. However, you not only refused to publish such criticisms but also devised all ways and means to defend Teng T'o's anti-Party and anti-socialist crimes. You gave lip service to "contention of a hundred schools of thought," but in point of fact you tolerated "the contention of only one school" -- the bourgeoisie. This is to say only you are allowed to oppose the Party and socialism and to propagate the poison of capitalism, but the workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary cadres are not allowed to defend the Party and socialism and to uproot your poisonous weeds. What you have put in force is in every way the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In November, 1965, there was an abrupt change in the situation on the front of socialist cultural revolution. A new counter-offensive was launched, and Teng T'o's collaborator, Wu Han, was exposed. If the Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao were genuinely interested in exposing Teng T'o, you still could take the initiative at that time. But you did not take this course of action. Instead, you also asked Teng T'o to write reports and articles to support and shelter Wu Han.

The objective class struggle does not shift with the subjective will of man. The struggle penetrates ever deeper. The features of the union of Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and Teng T'o to oppose the Party and socialism have been completely brought to light.

With the broad masses of the readers harboring great dissatisfaction and resentment for Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao, and Peking Wan-pao because they shelter Teng T'o and suppress criticism, there is no alternative but to lift the lid. At that time, in order to free yourselves from the passive position of waiting to be attacked, and -- more important still -- in order to give better protection to Teng T'o and other persons, you have brought up the question of Teng T'o in a hurry.

Is it self-contradictory to say that the object of bringing up the question of Teng T'o is to give better protection to him and other persons? No, there is no contradiction in this connection.

For the sake of protecting Wu Han, had not Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao taken the positive step of publishing Hsiang Yang-sheng's article criticizing Wu Han more than three months ago? Bringing up the question of Teng T'o is nothing more than a repetition of this farce -- pretending to expose Teng T'o but actually supporting him, pretending to criticize him but actually sheltering him, pretending to wage a struggle against him but actually protecting him.

In their "editor's notes" Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao try their utmost to shun the question of Teng T'o's attack against the Party and socialism. Teng T'o -- the most important figure in the "Three-Family Village" -- is given the least important place in the "editor's notes" of Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao. Wu Han is the one who "attacks the Party and socialism," Liao Mo-sha is the "leading general" against the Party and socialism, but Teng T'o is neither anti-Party nor anti-socialist. Things of greater and lesser importance are transposed, the vital parts are covered up, chariots and horses are sacrificed so that the commander-in-chief may be preserved -- this is a sleight of hand played by Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao on the question of protecting Teng T'o.

The data published by Peking Jih-pao in "criticism" of Teng T'o likewise makes no mention of the question of Teng T'o attacking the Party and socialism. The excerpts from the Night Causerie at Yenshan which cover two full pages only use two plain and inconspicuous short subtitles to refer to Teng T'o's "making veiled criticism of contemporary people with ancient characters." Teng T'o's reactionary statements which maliciously attack the Party, the general line, the great leap forward and the people's communes, and his articles which cry out against the injustice done to the

Right opportunists, that is, the revisionists, who have been demoted in ranks or relieved of their offices -- including himself -- are briskly described as "vulgar and meaningless" and things for "self-appreciation." At most they do nothing more than to "prettify the feudal social system" and to publicize bourgeois ideas.

On April 19, this year, the Peking Jih-pao again distributed a copy of "Selected Topics for Reference in Connection with the Criticism of the Night Causerie at Yenshan" saying that "Teng T'o is a reactionist in art" who "stands on the stage of the ancient people" "to publicize that the oldest art is best," thus continuing to give shelter to Teng T'o and attempting to lead the reading public to orient the brunt of criticism against Teng T'o in the direction of "worshipping and learning from the ancient."

The vital political problems of opposing the Party and socialism and of preparing public opinion for capitalist restoration have thus disappeared.

Can this be called "criticism?" Is it not more in correspondence with reality to describe it as seeking to cover up mistakes, shelter the villains and defraud the reading public?

The "editor's note" of Ch'ien-hsien and Peking Jih-pao says: "The lesson we have learned in this struggle is a very profound one. In the past, because we had loosened our grip on the class struggle on the cultural and academic front, the representative characters of the bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party availed of the opportunity to move in. They made use of academic articles, satirical essays and other forms of writing to oppose the Party and socialism, and of special columns in newspapers and magazines to open up their "free market" ... This paper and periodical have published in the past such articles without criticizing them at the right time. This is wrong. The reason is that we have not put proletarian politics in command and our minds are influenced by bourgeois and feudal ideas. As a result, we have forfeited our standpoint or vigilance in this serious struggle?"

Can this be called self-criticism?

"The lesson is a very profound one." What is the lesson?

"We loosened our grip on the class struggle on the cultural and academic front." Are they really so slack?

"The representative characters of the bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party availed of the opportunity to move in, and made use of academic articles, satirical essays and other forms of writing to oppose the Party and socialism." Is it true that other people have availed of the opportunity to move in? Is it true that they have been utilized by other people?

"The reason is that we have not put proletarian politics in command." Without putting proletarian politics in command, the politics of which class has then been put in command?

"Our minds are influenced by bourgeois and feudal ideas." Are they only influenced by a wee bit of bourgeois and feudal ideas?

"As a result, we have forfeited our standpoint or vigilance in this serious struggle." Is it a forfeiture of standpoint? Is it a forfeiture of vigilance?

The answer to all these questions is no.

For quite a long period of time in the past few years, the Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao themselves have been the tools of Teng T'o, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha for launching a rabid attack against the Party and socialism. The question of your being unconsciously "utilized" by other people has never arisen. This position of yours is not a proletarian one but a bourgeois one. For quite a long period of time in the past, Teng T'o, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha have safely entrenched themselves as officials and lords in the CCP Peking Municipal Committee and the Peking Municipal People's Council. You issue orders, loyally carry out the revisionist line and attempt to realize the dream of capitalist restoration by means of "peaceful evolution." There has never been any question of "the representative characters of the bourgeoisie availing of the opportunity to move in." You flaunt the "red banner" but are opposed to the red banner. You put on the mantle of Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung, but are opposed to Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung. You shout the slogans of proletarian dictatorship and socialism to uglify proletarian dictatorship and the socialist system. You hang up the signboard of the Communist Party, and take for your own use the names of Party publications to oppose the Party and socialism. At the critical juncture of the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads in China, you have at all times adopted the bourgeois standpoint to intensify the sharp class struggle against the proletariat, and have never loosened

your grip on the class struggle. You have not put proletarian politics in command, but have put bourgeois politics in command. Your bourgeois, reactionary way of thinking is most obstinate, you steadfastly adhere to the reactionary standpoint of the bourgeoisie, your bourgeois, reactionary scent is very sharp, and your bourgeois party spirit is very strong. Not long ago you still wielded your axe to chop away the vital issues in articles written by other people to criticize Teng T'ao, saying "this is irrelevant," "that cannot be established," and "regardless of what other people may do, we still adhere to academic discussion." How can it be said that such a mind is only influenced by a wee bit of bourgeois and feudal ideas, or has forfeited its standpoint and vigilance?

What is false is false, and the mask should be removed. Powder and rouge cannot cover up an ugly face. You have in the past disseminated a lot of poison, released many spirits and demons, and made use of numerous malicious tricks to resist the cultural revolution. Can you satisfy the reading public with a few words which are devoid of substance today?

It is time for Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao to revolutionize themselves thoroughly. When the black storm started by the class enemies at home and abroad was raging, who actively supported the anti-Party and anti-socialist activities of Teng T'ao, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha? After the revolutionary masses hit back at the anti-Party and anti-socialist activities of Teng T'ao, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha, who made use of various devices to shelter Teng T'ao, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha? After it was known that the question of Teng T'ao, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha could not be covered up, who instructed you to use the tactic of making faked criticism which sought "to sacrifice the chariots and horses so as to preserve the commander-in-chief?" There is now way for you to cover up and shun all these questions. You cannot hide things for long because the eyes of the masses are sharp. The masses will expose what you have not exposed and criticize what you have not criticized. We believe that all comrades who want to make revolution in the editorial departments of the Ch'ien-hsien, Peking Jih-pao and Peking Wan-pao certainly can courageously come forward, hold high the red banner of the thought of Mao Tse-tung, make a clean break with the representative characters of the bourgeoisie, and daringly expose and criticize your criminal deeds against the Party and socialism.

The anti-Party case of Teng T'ao, Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and other persons -- which is well organized, well planned and well led -- should arouse our high degree of vigilance. The powerful socialist revolutionary forces have driven group after group of the representative characters of the bourgeoisie off the stage, but this is not equal to say that all is now well. We should see that some other representative characters of the bourgeoisie would continue to go up the stage to give performances. The only difference is that the patterns of their performances constantly vary. Some are naked and some are more covert. Sometimes the attacking forces are dispersed, and sometimes a concentrated attack is made. We must play an active part in the present movement, firmly wage a struggle against the representative characters of the bourgeoisie of all shades, and carry the socialist cultural revolution through to the end.

Armed with the thought of Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese people are invincible. All demons and spirits which have been released or are still in hiding, which are on the stage or at the back-stage, will collapse when they are confronted by so great a force. Like the sun about to set over the western hills, the moribund capitalist system will share the tragic fate of the fallen leaves in the autumn wind. How can a handful of ephemeras rock the tall tree of socialism?

CSO: 3530-D

- END -