



**THE GREAT
SOCIALIST
CULTURAL
REVOLUTION
IN CHINA**

(2)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**THE GREAT SOCIALIST
CULTURAL REVOLUTION
IN CHINA**

(2)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1966

CONTENTS

OPEN FIRE AT THE BLACK ANTI-PARTY AND ANTI-SOCIAL- IST LINE! BY KAO CHU	1
HEIGHTEN OUR VIGILANCE AND DISTINGUISH THE TRUE FROM THE FALSE BY HO MING	7
TENG TO'S EVENING CHATS AT YENSHAN IS ANTI-PARTY AND ANTI-SOCIALIST DOUBLE-TALK COMPILED BY LIN CHIEH, MA TSE-MIN, YEN CHANG-KUEI, CHOU YING, TENG WEN-SHENG AND CHIN TIEN-LIANG	12
ON THE BOURGEOIS STAND OF FRONTLINE AND THE PEKING DAILY BY CHI PEN-YU	50

OPEN FIRE AT THE BLACK ANTI-PARTY AND ANTI-SOCIALIST LINE!

BY KAO CHU

Chairman Mao has often warned us: After the enemies with guns have been wiped out, there are still enemies without guns; they will certainly fight us tooth and nail, and in no circumstance must we take them lightly. The struggle between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism continues right through the entire socialist stage. To ensure socialist construction and prevent the restoration of capitalism, it is imperative to carry the socialist revolution on the political, economic, ideological and cultural fronts through to the end. We must always bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings and must never lose sight of the enemy in the ideological realm and forget the class struggle.

Evening Chats at Yenshan by Teng To and *Notes from Three-Family Village* written by the trio under the signature of Wu Nan-hsing (Wu stands for Wu Han, Nan for Ma Nantsun, Teng To's pen-name, and hsing for Fan Hsing, Liao Mo-sha's pen-name) prove to the hilt that the class struggle is still very sharp, complex and intense in our society. The class enemies are desperately attacking and trying to undermine us not only from without but also from within, and all anti-Party and anti-socialist elements invariably direct the spearhead of their attack at our Party and the socialist system.

Teng To is the manager of the Three-Family Village gangster inn run by Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and himself. He is a ringleader of this handful of anti-Party and anti-socialist elements. They controlled the fortnightly *Frontline* (*Qian-*

xian), the *Peking Daily* (*Beijing Ribao*) and the *Peking Evening News* (*Beijing Wanbao*) and used them as anti-Party weapons, shooting a great many poisoned arrows in violent attacks on the Party and on socialism.

The anti-Party and anti-socialist activities of Teng To and a handful of others were definitely not a fortuitous and isolated phenomenon. In 1958, illumined by Mao Tse-tung's thought and guided by the Party's General Line, the Chinese people, going all out and aiming high, made a great leap forward in all fields. On the political, economic, ideological and cultural fronts, they charged at the remnants of capitalism and feudalism with the force of a thunderbolt. As the socialist revolution deepened, the Right opportunists within the Party, catering to the need of imperialism and modern revisionism and of the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists at home, launched a ferocious attack on the Party at its Lushan meeting in 1959. Under the brilliant leadership of the Central Committee of the Party and Chairman Mao, the meeting dealt a resolute counter-blow at the Right opportunists, disarmed them and dismissed them from office, completely smashing their anti-Party scheme. Later, between 1959 and 1962, our country encountered temporary economic difficulties owing to serious natural calamities in successive years and to the sabotage of the Khrushchov modern revisionists. Gloating over our difficulties, the class enemies at home and abroad quickly raised their ugly heads, and the Right opportunists inside the Party launched a new attack on the Party in co-ordination with them. It was in these circumstances that Teng To and his gang "broke through the door and dashed out" in a great hurry.

Teng To and his gang, harbouring a deep-seated hatred for the Party and socialism, began to produce their *Evening Chats at Yenshan* and *Notes from Three-Family Village* in 1961. In the guise of recounting historical anecdotes, imparting knowledge, telling stories and cracking jokes, they launched an all-out and venomous attack on our great Party, using ancient

things to satirize the present, reviling one thing while pointing to another, and making insinuations and oblique thrusts. They abused our Party as being "fanatical", suffering from a "high fever", indulging in "great empty talk" and being afflicted with "amnesia". They scurrilously described the General Line and the great leap forward as "boasting", "indulging in fantasy", "substituting illusion for reality", "the total destruction" of "the family wealth consisting of a single egg" and "running one's head against the brick wall" of reality. They complained about the "injustice" done to the Right opportunists dismissed from office, lauded them for their anti-Party "inflexibility" and their "rebel character", and encouraged them to stage a come-back. They vilified the dictatorship of the proletariat, did their utmost to incite feelings of dissatisfaction with the socialist system and preached the corrupt and decadent feudal moral code and bourgeois ideology, in order to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism. Teng To even arrogantly clamoured that our Party should retire and "take a rest" without any delay, say nothing and do nothing, but follow their "instructions" in everything and let them exercise dictatorship over us.

Comrades, please consider: Didn't the Khrushchov modern revisionists accuse us of "bragging" and "boasting" and traduce the great leap forward as an act of "adventurism"? Didn't they praise the "manly act" of the Right opportunists within our Party? What difference is there between Teng To's anti-Party and anti-socialist outbursts and the slanderous attacks which the Khrushchov revisionists hurled against us?

Teng To's *Evening Chats at Yenshan* is couched in hundred per cent gangster double-talk which is directed against the Party and against socialism. We must identify it, see through it and uncover it, ridding it of its disguises and exposing the ugly anti-Party and anti-socialist features of Teng To and his clique to the light of day. Debts must be repaid. Teng To wanted to "cross the sea under camouflage", thinking that "decamping is the best of the thirty-six stratagems", but that

is impossible. Teng To cannot slip away, nor can his cohorts. Not only *Evening Chats at Yenshan* and *Notes from Three-Family Village*, but *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*, *Li Hui-niang*, *Hsieh Yao-huan* and the poisonous weeds in *Long and Short Notes*, etc. must be eradicated. Without exception all anti-Party and anti-socialist rubbish must be eliminated.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that on April 16 the *Peking Daily* devoted three whole pages to material printed under the banner headline "A Criticism of Three-Family Village and *Evening Chats at Yenshan*" with an editorial note by *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily*. For a long time *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* have shielded Wu Han and his like. Now, all of a sudden they became "active" and published this stuff in a great hurry. What does this all mean? Do they really want to "unfold a serious criticism"? No, not at all. There was much finesse in this move. In fact, they are providing cover for Teng To and his company in the name of criticism, affording them protection under the guise of struggle.

The editorial note of *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* relegates Teng To, the manager of the anti-Party and anti-socialist gangster inn, to the position of a shop assistant and casually dismisses such a serious case as Teng To's in a single sentence. Don't you think you have done your manager great injustice? In your carefully edited three pages of material, you give prominence and ample space to what is not crucial, such as "praising long hair", "encouraging the raising of dogs and cats", "the more ancient the work of art, the better", "advertising the leisurely interests and tastes of the feudal scholar-officials", "promoting feudal superstition", and so on and so forth. On the other hand, you only give a small amount of Teng To's most important anti-Party and anti-socialist stuff and moreover put it in inconspicuous places. What are you up to in evading the crucial point and turning big issues into small ones?

Frontline and the *Peking Daily* also indulge in a little "self-criticism", saying that they published the articles of Teng To and his cronies "without timely criticism" simply because their minds are "influenced by bourgeois and feudal ideas", because they have "relaxed the class struggle on the cultural and academic fronts", and because they have "not put proletarian politics in command" and have "lost our stand or vigilance". When we have finished reading your "self-criticism", we cannot help "breaking into laughter", as your Teng To put it. For a long time you have published many articles by Teng To and his cronies, ejected a great deal of poison and created a pestilential atmosphere, turning yourselves into tools for attacking the Party and socialism; is the slight "influence of bourgeois and feudal ideas" enough to account for all this? Even when Wu Han's anti-Party features were fully revealed, you staged the farce of "Chou Yu beating up Huang Kai" by publishing a fake criticism of Wu Han written by Hsiang Yang-sheng (Teng To's pseudonym), in which Wu Han's heinous crimes against the Party were described as an academic question of "the theory of the inheritance of the old ethical values". This was meant to absolve Wu Han of his crimes and help Teng To to slip through. Up to now you have continued to play tricks and put up a stubborn resistance. Is this "loss of stand or vigilance", or "relaxation of the class struggle"? No, certainly not! Far from losing your stand, you have taken a very firm stand — that of the bourgeoisie. Far from relaxing the class struggle, you have plunged yourselves whole-heartedly into the class struggle — against the proletariat.

So long as there are classes, there is bound to be class struggle. This is an inexorable law. To drag out a handful of anti-Party and anti-socialist elements from among our ranks is not a bad thing but a very good thing; it is a great victory for Mao Tse-tung's thought. The slanderous attacks of a handful of anti-Party and anti-socialist elements are merely the buzzing of a few flies which cannot dim the glory

of our Party in the least. We must sternly tell these elements that it is you who have long opened fire at the Party and socialism. "It is impolite not to give after receiving", as the saying goes. We will never let you or ogres of any sort get away. We will open fire at the black anti-Party and anti-socialist line and carry the great socialist cultural revolution through to the end. We will never stop till complete victory.

(First published in the *Liberation Army Daily*, May 8, 1966)

HEIGHTEN OUR VIGILANCE AND DISTINGUISH THE TRUE FROM THE FALSE

BY HO MING

On April 16, 1966 the *Peking Daily* (*Beijing Ribao*) devoted three whole pages to material printed under the banner headline "A Criticism of Three-Family Village and *Evening Chats at Yenshan*" and with an editorial note by the fortnightly *Frontline* (*Qianxian*) and the *Peking Daily*. This appeared to be very impressive and revolutionary, as though they were the first to launch an attack in the criticism of Teng To and his *Evening Chats at Yenshan*. What does all this mean? The class struggle is extremely complicated, and we must heighten our vigilance, distinguish the true from the false and never let ourselves be duped.

In their editorial note, *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* say that they want to "unfold a serious criticism of Three-Family Village and *Evening Chats at Yenshan*". Is this true? No, it is not; it is sham criticism but real protection, sham attack but real defence.

Teng To is head of the anti-Party, anti-socialist Three-Family Village and a ringleader of the gang. The editorial note, however, fails to mention the question of Teng To's being anti-Party and anti-socialist. It has to say that Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha are anti-Party and anti-socialist because they were already exposed some time ago. But, according to the editorial note, it seems that Wu Han is the commander-in-chief and Liao Mo-sha the "commanding general", but that Teng To is just a private who has unwittingly made some

mistakes which were only a matter of ideology and understanding.

This is an attempt to deceive the readers.

The republication of articles written by Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and Teng To and the material entitled "What Did *Evening Chats at Yenshan* Actually Advocate?" are carefully edited with the intention of sham criticism but real protection, sham attack but real defence.

Teng To's "Special Treatment for 'Amnesia'" is a most venomous piece of anti-Party writing, in which he viciously abuses our Party. It has long ago roused strong opposition on the part of some comrades. Therefore, the *Peking Daily* has no choice but to republish it, but does so under a headline in small type. We should like to ask: Is this piece not "important", or do you try to make it appear insignificant in order to hoodwink the readers? Why is it that you say nothing in your note about this most venomous anti-Party article?

The material "What Did *Evening Chats at Yenshan* Actually Advocate?" can be described in a few words — to give prominence to what is insignificant and cover up what is crucial, to evade serious matters and take up trifles, and to turn big issues into small ones.

For example, Teng To's "The Royal Way and the Tyrant's Way", an essay using ancient things to satirize the present, maliciously attacks the dictatorship of the proletariat. Teng To himself made the point clear that he referred to the "royal way and the tyrant's way" of the past because he wanted us to "draw a lesson". But the *Peking Daily* puts it under the heading "Idealizing All Aspects of the Feudal Social System". Why? Is "The Royal Way and the Tyrant's Way" really a historical essay? If such be the case, how can Teng To be described as "idealizing all aspects of the feudal social system" when he asserts that in the past the royal way was better than the tyrant's way? The heading and the article had nothing to do with each other. The reason is that the *Peking Daily* wants to turn the big issue of Teng To into a small one.

The sub-headings "Asserting That the Feudal Ruling Class Also Knew How to Treasure Labour Power", "The More Ancient the Work of Art, the Better", and "Promoting Feudal Superstition" are likewise tricks to turn the big issue of Teng To into a small one.

Nevertheless, there are also some headings which seemed all right at first sight, such as "Using Ancient Things to Satirize the Present and Attacking by Innuendo". But there are very few extracts under them. What is more, the sub-headings are rather odd, one of them being "Satirizing 'the Substitution of Illusion for Reality'", and another "Satirizing So-called Boasting". We should like to ask *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily*: Why don't you say a single word here? Why are you unwilling to mark out Teng To as anti-Party and anti-socialist? Whom does he satirize in "satirizing the present"? And whom is he "attacking by innuendo"? Teng To has written many articles "using ancient things to satirize the present and attacking by innuendo", attacking the Party and attacking socialism, but why do you extract so little from them?

Obviously, *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* are hurriedly putting up the banner of "A Criticism of Three-Family Village and *Evening Chats at Yenshan*" and publishing some material because, with the deepening of the cultural revolution, the anti-Party and anti-socialist features of Teng To, Liao Mo-sha and Wu Han have been exposed. The so-called unfolding of serious criticism is false and their true purpose is to shorten their positions to cover up their retreat.

In their editorial note, *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* say ostentatiously that "the lesson we have learned from this struggle is profound". But what profound lesson have they learned?

First, in the past "we have relaxed the class struggle on the cultural and academic fronts". Have you really "relaxed the class struggle"? No. In the last few years you have spread a great number of poisonous weeds, virulently attack-

ing the Party and opposing socialism; you have pigeon-holed articles criticizing these poisonous weeds, refused to publish them and tried by all means to defend Teng To and his like. Since the criticism of *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* began, you have published "From *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* to the Theory of the Inheritance of the Old Ethical Values" written by Teng To under the pseudonym Hsiang Yang-sheng, trying hard to drag the anti-Party and anti-socialist political question of Wu Han into the "pure" academic sphere of inheriting old ethical values, and to divert the great polemic to the Right. Can this be called a "relaxation of the class struggle"? No. It shows that, standing on the side of the bourgeoisie, you are intensifying the class struggle against the proletariat!

Secondly, "our magazine and paper published these articles without timely criticism". How very mild! Can this be just a case of failure to make timely criticism? Why didn't your editorial departments offer any real criticism of "these articles" when the criticism of *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* began, or for that matter since then, not to mention earlier? How can an incendiary deceive people by saying that his only fault is failure to put out the fire in time?

Thirdly, "we lost our stand or vigilance". Was this so? No, you have not lost your stand—you are very firm in your stand, the stand of the bourgeoisie. However, there is some truth in your speaking of "loss of vigilance". You have made a wrong estimate of the situation. In the last few years you believed that the time had come and you spread a great number of poisonous weeds. After the criticism of *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* began, you thought you could slip by and so took all possible measures to protect the bad elements. In so doing you have revealed your true features. Perhaps, this may be called "loss of vigilance"!

We have to ask *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily*: In recent years have you served as bulwarks of the proletariat, or as

bulwarks of the bourgeoisie? Are you instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or instruments of propaganda for the restoration of capitalism? How far do you want to go?

I have aired my views because I felt an urge to speak my mind; if there is anything wrong in what I have said, I hope *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* will give their criticism and correct me.

(First published in the *Kuangming Daily*, May 8, 1966)

TENG TO'S EVENING CHATS AT YENSHAN IS ANTI-PARTY AND ANTI-SOCIALIST DOUBLE-TALK

COMPILED BY LIN CHIEH, MA TSE-MIN,
YEN CHANG-KUEI, CHOU YING, TENG WEN-SHENG
AND CHIN TIEN-LIANG

FOREWORD

Since 1961 Teng To has published a series of anti-Party and anti-socialist articles in Frontline (Qianxian), the Peking Daily (Beijing Ribao) and the Peking Evening News (Beijing Wanbao), launching fierce onslaughts on the Party and on socialism. As early as the time of their publication, these anti-Party and anti-socialist views aroused opposition among many comrades who sent in criticisms to Frontline, the Peking Daily and the Peking Evening News. But the latter refused to publish these contributions and suppressed them.

As a result of the recent thorough exposure of the anti-Party and anti-socialist features of Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and others, it was no longer possible to cover up Teng To's features either. Therefore, Frontline and the Peking Daily hurriedly printed some excerpts from Evening Chats at Yenshan with an editorial note.

In their editorial note, Frontline and the Peking Daily kept quiet about Teng To's opposition to the Party and socialism and, with the same intention of hushing things up, arranged their extracts from Evening Chats at Yenshan in such a way as to hide the fundamental issue of Teng To's opposition to the Party and socialism.

In our opinion, Teng To's Evening Chats at Yenshan is a lot of double-talk against the Party and socialism. Therefore, we have made our own compilation of passages from the Evening Chats and added a number of comments. It is our hope that the readers will make a comparative study of our extracts and those compiled by Frontline and the Peking Daily.

I. VENOMOUS ATTACKS ON OUR GREAT PARTY

Viciously Attacking the Scientific Thesis That "The East Wind Prevails Over the West Wind" as "Great Empty Talk" and a "Cliche"

"Some people have the gift of the gab. They can talk endlessly on any occasion, like water flowing from an undammed river. After listening to them, however, when you try to recall what they have said, you can remember nothing."

"Making long speeches without really saying anything, making confusion worse confounded by explaining, or giving explanations which are not explanatory — these are the characteristics of great empty talk."

"We cannot deny that in certain special situations such great empty talk is inevitable, and therefore in a certain sense is a necessity. Still, it will be quite awful if great empty talk should be made into a prevalent fashion indulged in on every occasion or even cultivated as a special skill. It will be still more disastrous if our children should be taught this skill and turned into hordes of experts in great empty talk."

"As chance would have it, my neighbour's child has recently often imitated the style of some great poet and put into writing a lot of 'great empty talk'. . . . Not long ago he wrote a poem entitled 'Ode to Wild Grass' which is nothing but empty talk. The poem reads as follows:

*The Venerable Heaven is our father,
The Great Earth is our mother*

*And the Sun is our nanny;
The East Wind is our benefactor
And the West Wind is our enemy."*

"Although such words as heaven, earth, father, mother, sun, nanny, the East Wind, the West Wind, benefactor and enemy catch our eye, they are used to no purpose here and have become mere cliches."

"Recourse to even the finest words and phrases is futile, or rather, the more such cliches are uttered, the worse the situation will become. Therefore I would advise those friends given to great empty talk to read more, think more, say less and take a rest when the time comes for talking, so as to save their own as well as other people's time and energy."

("Great Empty Talk", *Frontline*, No. 21, 1961)

Comment: "The East Wind prevails over the West Wind" is a scientific thesis advanced by Chairman Mao Tse-tung at the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties on November 18, 1957. It says by way of a vivid image that the international situation has reached a new turning point and that the forces of socialism are prevailing over the forces of imperialism. The East Wind symbolizes the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces of the proletariat and of the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The West Wind symbolizes the decadent forces of imperialism and reaction in all countries. It is entirely correct to praise the East Wind and to detest the West Wind. Why then should Teng To pick up the statement, "The East Wind is our benefactor and the West Wind is our enemy", and malign it as great empty talk and a cliché? The Khrushchov revisionists have said inflammatorily that

it is necessary to "oppose the dogmatic theories concerning a mythical competition between 'the West and East Winds' more boldly and more resolutely". Thus Teng To here is singing the same tune as that of Khrushchov.

**Insinuating That Our Party Leadership Is "Conceited"
and "Looks Down on the Masses"**

"The wisdom of a man is never unlimited. Only an idiot fondly imagines that he knows everything and has an inexhaustible supply of wisdom, for that as a matter of fact is absolutely impossible. . . . some people appear clever, but strictly speaking, they are only seemingly clever or only clever in a trifling way and cannot be considered really clever, let alone wise."

"Lao Tzu took an extreme position in this matter, and later the Kings of the Six Kingdoms went to the other extreme. The former wanted to obliterate all wisdom and good sense and negate everything, whereas the latter relied on their own wisdom and became blindly conceited. Naturally, neither attained good results. The root of their mistake was that they did not value the wisdom of the masses."

"The best ideas can only be produced from among the masses. During the reign of Emperor Yuan of the Han Dynasty, Prime Minister Kuang Heng memorialized the emperor, 'I have heard that one should consult and follow the multitude, as this is what Heaven wills.' . . . at the time of Emperor Kuang Wu of the same dynasty, the noted scholar Cheng Hsing also counselled the emperor that he should 'seek advice from all sides and accept suggestions from below'. Fan Yao-fu, son of Fan Chung-yen of the Sung Dynasty, gave the following advice to Szuma Kuang: 'I hope that you will be modest in order to promote the discussion of state affairs among the masses. One need not plan everything oneself. When a man plans everything himself, flatterers will seize the chance to

say things to please him.' The views of these ancients are all very good. Fan Yao-fu's idea that 'one need not plan everything oneself' deserves particular attention. **Some people, however, are always boastful and conceited; they look down on the masses and make all decisions themselves in the hope of achieving success with original ideas and reject good advice from below.** If such people are not aware of their shortcoming and do not try to overcome it, they will eventually suffer heavy reverses."

("Is Wisdom Reliable?" *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. IV, pp. 17-19; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, February 22, 1962)

Comment: Why should Teng To dwell today on such old stories as that of Kuang Heng counselling Emperor Yuan to "consult and follow the multitude" and of Cheng Hsing counselling Emperor Kuang Wu to "accept suggestions from below"? He is obliquely attacking our great Party as "being conceited and looking down on the masses". This becomes clear when we compare what he says with the slanders the Khrushchov revisionists spread against us. Are not Teng To's words identical with the modern revisionists' vilifications of our Party?

Slandering Our Party as "Going Back on Its Own Word" and Being "Untrustworthy"

"There are many people afflicted with diseases . . . one of which is called 'amnesia'. This is a very troublesome ailment, and whoever suffers from it cannot be cured easily."

"Such a patient . . . often shows such symptoms as going back on his own word and failing to keep faith, and people

are even inclined to suspect that he is feigning idiocy and is therefore untrustworthy."

"In *More Stories Told by Ai Tzu* by Lu Cho of the Ming Dynasty, there is a tale which presents a typical case of amnesia:

There was a man in Chi State who was so forgetful that he forgot to stop once he started walking and forgot to rise once he lay down. His wife was much worried. She said to him, 'I have heard that Ai Tzu is a witty and clever man and can treat the most baffling diseases. Why don't you go and consult him?' The man replied, 'Very good.' He rode away on horseback, bringing his bow and arrow with him. Having gone a short distance, he felt a call of nature and dismounted. He thrust his arrow into the earth and fastened his horse to a tree. Having eased himself, he looked to the left and then exclaimed on seeing his arrow, 'My God! What a narrow escape! Where is this arrow from? It nearly hit me!' He looked to the right and at the sight of his horse, cried in joy, 'Although I am badly scared, I have got a horse.' When he was about to start off again, rein in hand, he suddenly trampled on his own leavings. Stamping his feet, he complained, 'I've trodden on some dog's dung and ruined my shoes! What a pity!' He whipped the horse and rode home. Soon he reached his house and hesitated before the gate, wondering to himself, 'Who lives here? Is this Master Ai's house?' His wife saw his bewilderment and knew that he had lost his memory again and gave him a scolding. The man was puzzled, asking: 'We are not acquainted, madam. What do you swear at me for?'

Apparently this man was a bad case of amnesia. But we cannot tell how such case would be at its very worst — presumably it would result either in insanity or in idiocy.

"According to ancient Chinese medical books, . . . one of the causes of amnesia is the abnormal functioning of the so-

called breath of life. In consequence, the patient not only suffers from loss of memory but gradually becomes **capricious**, has great difficulty with his speech, gets **irritable and finally goes mad and runs amuck**. Another cause is the injury to the brain. The patient feels numb at times and the blood rushes from his heart to his head, causing occasional fainting fits. Unless treated in time, he will become an idiot. Thus if anyone finds either of these symptoms present in himself, he **must promptly take a complete rest and say nothing and do nothing, and if he insists on speaking and acting, he will come to grief**.

“Are there then really no positive methods for treating this disease? Certainly there are. For example . . . when the patient has a bad attack, you **immediately go and get a bucketful of dog’s blood and pour it over his head, and then pour cold water over it so as to make him a little more clear-headed**. . . . According to modern Western medicine, one way is to **hit the patient on the head with a specially made club to induce a state of ‘shock’ and then restore him to consciousness**.”

(“Special Treatment for ‘Amnesia’”,
 Frontline, No. 14, 1962)

Comment: Obviously, this is a piece showing the bitterest hatred in its attack on our great Party. There is no medical book which says that “going back on one’s own word and failing to keep faith” and being “capricious”, being “mad” or “running amuck” are symptoms of amnesia, and no pharmacopoeia prescribes such treatment for amnesia as pouring dog’s blood over the patient’s head and clubbing him unconscious. *More Stories Told by Ai Tzu* by Lu Cho of the Ming Dynasty contains political satires and is not a medical treatise.

Teng To is talking politics here, not medicine. This is an incontestable fact.

Slandering Our Party Leadership as “A Watery Chuke Liang”

“ ‘A Watery Chuke Liang’ is a most objectionable character. This nickname appears in an anecdote headed ‘Kuo Ni Compares Himself to Chuke Liang’ in the 15th volume of *Bedside Table Sketches (Cheng Shih)* by Yueh Ko, grandson of Yueh Fei. The story reads in part:

When Kuo Ti was garrison commander east of the Huai River and built the walls for two cities, Kuo Ni was on his staff. . . . Kuo Ni talked boastfully and nobody dared to challenge him. One day he inscribed the following lines on his fan:

*Three times in succession he was called on
 for advice about affairs of state;
 Under two kings the old minister gave his mind
 to ruling the country.*

In other words, he claimed to be like Chuke Liang. . . . I happened to visit Sze County in summer, and noticed that the two verses were indeed inscribed on a fan for guests. Thus what I had heard was not a groundless rumour. After Kuo Cho had been routed at Fuli and Kuo Chuan defeated at Yichen, Kuo Ni, in despair about mending the hopeless situation, shed tears in the presence of his guests. Peng Fa, who was fond of making jokes, was then a magistrate and witnessed the spectacle. He told people, ‘We have here a watery Chuke Liang.’ The joke got around and was much applauded. It reached Kuo Ni’s ears and he was nettled and wanted to punish Peng, but he was dismissed from office before he could carry out his intention.”

“Men like Kuo Ni, a watery Chuke Liang, simply make people laugh and also make their gorge rise. But the anecdote

shows that a person who poses as Chuke Liang will never scare people, and the day is bound to come when he will be revealed in his true colours and laughed at by the whole world."

("Three Kinds of Chuke Liang", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. IV, p. 12; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, March 1, 1962)

Comment: In bitterly attacking what he calls "a watery Chuke Liang", and saying "any person who poses as Chuke Liang" will be "revealed in his true colours", to whom is Teng To really referring? If he is referring to the landlord and capitalist classes, there is no need for such veiled ambiguity. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that he is maligning the leadership of our Party.

II. OPPOSING THE GENERAL LINE FOR SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND THE GREAT LEAP FORWARD AND ATTACKING THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Vilifying Our Great Leap Forward as "Boasting" and "Bragging", and Alleging That We Have "Run Our Heads Against the Brick Wall of Reality"

"When you have time, read some foreign folk tales or fables and you will profit much from them. . . . If you have the capacity to infer three points from one, with your discerning eye you will see through all the bogies and goblins, no matter what tricks they play."

"Suppose we look into *Aesop's Fables*. For example, there is the following fable:

A pentathlon athlete was often criticized by the people in a city state for his lack of courage. So he went

abroad for a time and on his return boasted of the many feats he had performed in various city states, and especially of a long jump he had made at Rhodes, a jump unequalled by any Olympic victor. He said, 'If any of you here goes to Rhodes next time, the eye-witnesses there will testify to my feat.' At this one of the bystanders said, 'Hey! If what you say is true, my man, you don't need witnesses. The place you stand on will do as well as Rhodes. Let us see the jump!'

"Facts clearly show that braggarts only boast and never take action. Even now one can always and everywhere find such braggarts. Their boastful talk may differ in degree, but is all alike in being merely boasts."

"This fable can also help people recognize the crafty braggarts for what they are and call their bluff."

"A fable by Krylov points the same moral:

A titlark flying over the sea boasted that it would boil the sea dry. . . . The rumour quickly spread and those easily taken in were the first to go to the seaside with spoons to join the feast of delicious fish soup."

"Followers of Ernst Mach exaggerated the role of what they called the 'psychological factor' and talked boastfully to their heart's content. Is this not the same as the titlark's nonsense about boiling the sea dry? Nevertheless, the Machians imagined that through reliance on the role of the psychological factor they could do whatever they pleased, but the result was that they ran their heads against the brick wall of reality and went bankrupt in the end."

("Two Foreign Fables", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. V, pp. 91-93; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, November 26, 1961)

Comment: Anyone with a discerning eye can see at once that this is vilification of our great leap forward,

slandering us as "boasting" and as "running our heads against the brick wall of reality". Unless this was the case, Teng To would not have taken so much trouble to talk about the "subtle meaning" of these fables which, he said, afford food for "deep thought". Why does he shout even today that "one can always and everywhere find such braggarts"? If he were merely telling stories, why should he speak of the role of the "psychological factor" vaunted by the Machians? Everyone knows that the imperialists and the Khrushchov revisionists have attacked our great leap forward as "braggadocio", "an adventurist project" and "voluntarism". The Right opportunists have likewise slandered it as "inflammation of the brain", "high fever" and "idealism". Pray, can this be mere coincidence?

"Readers of the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* will recall the scene in which Chuke Liang shed tears on ordering the execution of Ma Su. Chuke Liang quoted what Liu Pei had said before his death about Ma Su, namely that Ma Su was given to exaggeration and therefore could not be entrusted with important missions. . . . Liu Pei had read deeply into Ma Su's character. In his eyes, Ma Su was simply a braggart. **Even in ancient times men were thoroughly acquainted with the harmfulness of bragging.** It was because of this that Kuan Tzu said, 'Words must not exceed the reality, and the reality must not exceed its name.' This is a warning to people that they must **never brag or boast, that they should use caution in handling matters, should do more, talk less and, still less, court fame.**"

"Judging by the views of Wang Chung, a thinker of the Han Dynasty, it seems that throughout the ages the men

who ignored this maxim were mostly scholars or men of letters. In his book *Weighing of Views and Opinions*, Wang Chung said, 'The words of the followers of Confucius are too beautiful to be true.' Evidently he meant that literary men and their like are often fond of bragging. As a matter of fact, **literary men are by no means the only persons given to bragging, there are other people as well.**"

"Lu Cho ridiculed Chisun for bragging that, like Prince Meng Chang whom he envied, he too had three thousand retainers. But a little investigation knocked the bottom out of Chisun's boastful talk. Lu Cho's aim in this apocryphal story was to teach people not to boast."

"In history there have been many authentic cases of men who liked to boast. But these works of fiction, having a higher degree of generality and **summing up the various ways of bragging by means of typical situations, attract more attention, make people more vigilant and are, therefore, of greater educational significance.**"

("Stories About Bragging", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. V, pp. 88-90; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, June 11, 1961)

"Wang An-shih was a great statesman of the reforming school in the Sung Dynasty. He had many ideas for carrying out reforms, but he lacked practical knowledge and experience. In his *Miscellaneous Notes*, Chang Lei of the Sung Dynasty said:

When Wang An-shih was Prime Minister, he talked a great deal about building water conservancy projects in the country. He wanted to drain Lake Taihu of its water so as to reclaim tens of thousands of hectares of fertile land. People laughed at the idea. Once Wang An-shih talked about the matter to his guests. Academician Liu Kung-fu who

was present said quickly, 'That's easy to accomplish.' 'How?' Wang An-shih asked. Liu Kung-fu replied, 'All you have to do is to build another lake near by to hold the water of Lake Taihu.' At this Wang An-shih himself burst out laughing.

During the period when Wang An-shih was at the helm of state, similar jokes were circulated, all showing up the impractical nature of his many ideas. In particular, he was immodest, and this can be said to be his chief defect."

("Learn More and Criticize Less", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. II, p. 84; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, April 2, 1961)

Comment: Teng To again and again attacks what he calls "bragging" and "boasting" and says that "literary men are by no means the only persons" given to bragging, and that "great statesmen" have the same failing. Is he here talking about past history? No. He is satirizing the present in terms of the past, fondly hoping to incite people to oppose the Party's General Line and attack the great leap forward.

Slandering Our Party as Not Treasuring Labour Power During the Great Leap Forward

"As far back as the periods of the Spring and Autumn Annals and the Warring States and thereabout, there were many great statesmen who understood the importance of treasuring labour power. . . . Through the experience of their rule, they discovered the 'limits' on the 'expenditure of the people's labour power', in fact, they discovered certain objective laws governing the increase and decrease of labour power."

"It is written in the 'Chapter on the Royal System' of the *Book of Rites*: 'The people's labour power should be used for no more than three days each year.' On this statement Chen Hao, a scholar of the Yuan Dynasty, glossed: 'The people's labour power was used to build city-walls, roads, lanes, ditches, palaces and temples.' This actually refers in our present-day language to the labour power to be used in all kinds of capital construction. According to the level of the social productive forces of their times, the ancients fixed an amount of labour power to be used in all kinds of capital construction — approximately only one per cent of the total labour power available. As we see it today, this ratio is appropriate in an old country with agricultural production as its foundation."

"Drawing up plans for Prince Chung Erh of the state of Tsin, Hu Yen advised, 'After saving your strength for a dozen years, you can go far.' He was then escorting the prince past Wulu of the state of Wei, and even predicted that 'in twelve years you will conquer this land'. . . . From this story, it can be seen that a man like Hu Yen well understood how to accumulate strength in the historical circumstances of ancient times. If a man of the seventh century B.C. understood this truth, we who live in the sixties of the twentieth century should naturally understand it even better."

"We should draw new enlightenment from the experience of the ancients."

("The Theory of Treasuring Labour Power", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. I, pp. 56-58; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, April 30, 1961)

Comment: It is utter nonsense to say that the ancients discovered the "laws governing the increase and decrease of labour power". The statements that "we who live in the sixties of the twentieth century should naturally understand it even better" and that "we

should draw new enlightenment from the experience of the ancients" are evidently attacks on us, meaning that we did not treasure labour power during the great leap forward and in carrying out capital construction and water conservancy projects.

**Slandering Our Cause of Socialist Construction
as Being "Finished"**

"Indeed, the accumulation of great wealth often begins with a very small sum, just as a robe is the gathering together of many bits of fur or a river the confluence of many drops of water. This does not mean, however, that in all circumstances you have already amassed wealth when you possess only a single egg. Nothing is so simple and easy."

"Under Emperor Wan Li of the Ming Dynasty there lived a story writer named Chiang Ying-ko. One of his *Hsueh Tao's Tales* runs as follows:

Once there was a townsman who was so poor that he never knew where and when his next meal would be. One day by chance he found an egg. He told his wife elatedly, 'I have found our family wealth.' Asked where it was, he showed her the egg, saying, 'Here it is. But it will take ten years to build up our wealth.' Then he discussed his plan with his wife, 'I'll take the egg to the neighbour and have it hatched by his hen. When the chickens have grown up, I'll take back one of the females to lay eggs. I shall get 15 chickens a month. In two years they will multiply and make a total of 300. Then I shall sell them for ten taels of gold, with which I can buy five cows producing calves. My cows will multiply to 25 in three years and 150 in another three years. These I shall sell for 300 taels of gold. If I lend out the money at interest, I shall have amassed 500 taels of gold in three years.'

"The latter half of the story goes into rather uninteresting detail, so I would like to leave them out, except one point worth mentioning. In the end this greedy man said that he would take a concubine. At this **his wife was 'roused to great anger and smashed the egg with a blow of her fist.'** Thus his family wealth consisting of a single egg was totally destroyed.

"Don't you see that this story helps to explain a lot of things? This greedy man, too, realized that to build his family wealth would take a long time and hence in the discussion with his wife allowed himself **ten years** to do so. This seemed reasonable, but his plan was utterly lacking in any reliable basis and consisted entirely in a series of mere suppositions one piled on another. In picturing what would happen in the next ten years, he **completely substituted illusion for reality**, showing himself as one obsessed by greed for money. The result was that his wife flew into a rage and **with a blow of her fist she destroyed all his riches.**"

("The Family Wealth Consisting of a Single Egg", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. I, pp. 76-77; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, June 18, 1961)

Comment: When our Party set forward its plan for socialist economic construction, the Khrushchov revisionists shouted, "We have to wait and see if there is any truth in it." When we were in temporary difficulties, they attacked our great leap forward as having "failed" and "collapsed". In the present piece Teng To also makes talk of indulging in fantasy, "substituting illusion for reality", and "the family wealth consisting of a single egg" which is "totally destroyed", etc. Are not these also attacks on our great leap forward as having "failed"? Do they not chime in with the attacks of the Khrushchov revisionists?

Maliciously Attacking the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

“Ancient historians also made numerous comments on the royal way and the tyrant’s way. But how should we consider the royal way and the tyrant’s way from our present-day viewpoint?”

“In the section on ‘Expert Planning’ in his book *Historical Anecdotes Newly Arranged*, Liu Hsiang wrote, ‘The royal way is as smooth as a whetstone and stems from human sentiments and decorum.’ Elsewhere in the same book he said, ‘Following different ways, all the Three Dynasties established a royal rule; using different laws, the Five Tyrants established a tyrannical regime.’ Apparently, Liu Hsiang praised the royal way and disapproved of the tyrant’s way. **He regarded the royal way as the result of combining human sentiments with law and morality. This is right**, for it had been stated long before in the *Book of Rites*, ‘If rites, music, punishments and administration are carried out smoothly and correctly, the royal way will reach perfection.’ Therefore, **the so-called royal way actually refers to certain attitudes and actions taken by people in tackling all problems in a given historical period, according to the prevailing human sentiments and social moral standards and in harmony with the current political and judicial systems. On the contrary, if in disregard of everything one relied on authority and power, used violence and coercion, ordered others about and robbed the people by force or by trick, then that would be the so-called tyrant’s way.**”

“According to our present-day viewpoint and in our language, what then are the royal way and the tyrant’s way? The royal way can be interpreted as the honest and realistic way of thinking and style of work which follow the mass line. The tyrant’s way, on the other hand, can be interpreted as the arrogant subjectivist and dogmatic way of thinking and arbitrary

style of work. However, we should not force such interpretations on the ancients, whom it would be unrealistic to judge from such a viewpoint.”

“Nevertheless, it will not be difficult to draw a lesson from ancient history. This shows that, after all, even in ancient times the royal way was much better than the tyrant’s way. In recounting the situation in the period before the Chin and Han Dynasties when the princes were contending for hegemony, Pan Ku made satirical remarks on many occasions against the tyrant’s way in his *History of the Han Dynasty*. For instance, he wrote, ‘King Wen of the state of Tsin decided to follow the tyrant’s way. He attacked the state of Wei, captured the Earl of Tsao, defeated the state of Chu at Chengpu, and finally called a conference of the princes.’ Thus people can see at a glance how **those who wanted to be tyrants made enemies everywhere and became very unpopular!**”

(“The Royal Way and the Tyrant’s Way”,
Evening Chats at Yenshan, Vol. IV, pp. 13-
16; first appeared in the *Peking Evening
News*, February 25, 1962)

Comment: Using the past to satirize the present, this article maliciously attacks the dictatorship of the proletariat. Teng To says slanderously that we “relied on authority and power”, “used violence and coercion”, and “became unpopular”. We would like to ask, with whom are we unpopular? We are unpopular with the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists. To these people, the dictatorship of the proletariat can apply only the “tyrant’s way”, not the policy of benevolence. To apply the “royal way” or the policy of benevolence to them would mean betrayal of the revolution and the people.

III. COMPLAINING ABOUT INJUSTICE TO THE RIGHT OPPORTUNISTS WHO WERE DISMISSED FROM OFFICE, PRAISING THEIR ANTI-PARTY "BACKBONE" AND ENCOURAGING THEM TO STAGE A COME-BACK

Defending Li San-tsai, Secretary of the Board of Census, Who Was Dismissed from Office

"Among the historical figures of Peking, Li San-tsai of the Ming Dynasty, a native of Tungchow, has long fallen into oblivion. **This is a regrettable thing** for students of local history.

"When I recently talked with a few friends, all historians, this man's name chanced to crop up. On returning home, I looked up some historical material and discovered that the verdict of old historians on Li San-tsai is quite questionable and **should be re-assessed**.

"Li San-tsai (courtesy name, Tao-fu, pen-name, Hsiu-wu) became a licentiate in the second year of the reign of Wan Li. He served successively as 'deputy imperial prosecutor', 'Governor of Fengyang' and 'Secretary of the Board of Census'. He opposed the prevalent methods of collecting the mining tax and was an active supporter of the Tunglin Party. He is a well-known figure in the *History of the Ming Dynasty*.

"The *History of the Ming Dynasty* compiled in the early Ching Dynasty by Chang Ting-yu and others contains a biography of Li San-tsai which concludes with the following sentences by way of summing up:

A man of great talents, San-tsai was fond of stratagems and adept at ingratiating himself with court officials. During the thirteen years he served as Governor of Fengyang, he made friends all over the country. Being unable to keep away from corruption, he was attacked by others. Those who later censured San-tsai, like Shao Fu-chung and Hsu Chao-kuei, were all followers of Wei Chung-hsien whose names were on the list of traitors, while those who recommended him, such as Ku Hsien-cheng, Tsou Yuan-piao, Chao Nan-

hsing and Liu Tsung-chou, were all distinguished high officials. Therefore, the public regarded San-tsai as a wise man.

"The *History of the Ming Dynasty* characterized Li San-tsai as a man 'fond of stratagems and adept at ingratiating himself with court officials'. This is not a complimentary remark. If that had been true, **Li San-tsai would have been a political schemer and intriguer. But the facts tell another story.** According to *The Truthful Record of Emperor Shen Tsung*, in the 27th and 28th years of the reign of Wan Li (Emperor Shen Tsung) Li San-tsai time and again memorialized the emperor on the abuses perpetrated in taxing mines. He boldly exposed the crimes committed by the eunuchs in collecting such taxes, their wholesale extortions and transgressions of the law. In the 30th and 31st years of the reign, he again repeatedly memorialized the emperor, **expressing his opposition to the mining tax and proposing the prevention and control of floods and droughts by dredging rivers, digging canals and building sluice gates.** The emperor accepted none of these proposals; on the contrary, he punished Li San-tsai by 'depriving him of his salary for five months'. How could he be described as being 'fond of stratagems and adept at ingratiating himself with court officials'?"

"As he had repeatedly memorialized the emperor to no avail, Li San-tsai begged to resign from office and retire home."

"Of course, the 'Tunglin Party' also emerged at the time to attack dark feudal politics, and 'San-tsai maintained intimate connections with its members'. For this reason, **the corrupt die-hard forces** violently attacked Li San-tsai as well as members of the Tunglin Party, such as Ku Hsien-cheng and Kao Pan-lung. Small wonder that subsequently Wei Chung-hsien and his gang should have regarded Li San-tsai together with the Tunglin Party as their sworn enemies.

"It was only natural that, incited by the eunuchs, the corrupt die-hard forces represented by Shao Fu-chung and Hsu Chao-

kuei should have heaped abuse on Li San-tsai. They accused him of being 'a great villain feigning loyalty and a big hypocrite feigning uprightness', and 'listed his four major crimes of corruption, deception, guile and tyranny'. Even after Li San-tsai **had finally retired home**, they again trumped up the charge against him of 'stealing imperial timber to build his private mansion'. **Perhaps this was the factual basis of the statement in the History of the Ming Dynasty that he was 'unable to keep away from corruption'**. But Li San-tsai repeatedly memorialized the emperor, asking that 'eunuchs be sent to conduct a trial', that 'court officials come to investigate' and that 'the emperor personally hear my case'. **He seemed to be in the right and self-confident, but the court of Emperor Wan Li dared not make a thorough investigation of the facts. Isn't it clear how things really stood?"**

"Judging by the facts about Li San-tsai during his lifetime and those facts which came to light after his death, we should regard him as a **positive historical figure**, though we cannot say that his character was entirely blameless."

("In Defence of Li San-tsai", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. V, pp. 102-04; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, March 29, 1962)

Comment: Li San-tsai was an insignificant historical figure. He was a butcher who suppressed peasant uprisings. But Teng To described him as a good official who spoke out for the people and worked for their welfare. He defends him because of his dismissal from office, saying that he was "in the right and self-confident". Why? It is easy to see that Li San-tsai was a man of the type of Hai Jui. Under the guise of defending Li San-tsai, Teng To is really complaining on behalf of the Right opportunists.

Acclaiming the "Inflexibility" of Cheng Pan-chiao Who, After Being Dismissed from Office on a "Framed-up Charge", Nursed Bitter Hatred; Calling on People to Imitate His Example of "Being His Own Master" and "Refusing to Act as a Menial"

*"In Yangchow, the land of song and music,
he was known as an eccentric
Reading amidst the fragrance of orchids
and shade of bamboos.*

**With his brush he painted a moral like that
of Spring and Autumn Annals,
His ten ballads voiced the eternal passions
of Heaven and Earth.**

**He became himself only after discarding the
official's hat,**

*The splash of ink and water was his ideal.
Now Pan-chiao is gone but the bridge of
Hungchiao still stands,
And hills without number look intensely
clear and blue.*

"This is a poem in the classical pattern which I wrote during a visit to Yangchow two years ago [1961] in memory of Cheng Pan-chiao, a Ching painter and poet. . . . Tomorrow is the anniversary of his birth, and I think it is perhaps still necessary to use the opportunity to make a re-assessment of this writer."

"In the fifth year of the reign of Emperor Chien Lung, he was appointed magistrate of Fanhsien County in Shantung and in the eleventh was transferred to Weihsien County. **For several years in succession natural calamities befell Shantung; his active efforts to collect relief funds incurred the disfavour of the influential gentry and wealthy merchants. Charged with 'corruption and embezzlement', he was dismissed from office.**"

"Cheng Pan-chiao did an excellent job in his relief work in Shantung. **He stood completely on the side of the people and worked for the welfare of the masses suffering from natural**

calamities, and for this he aroused the anger of the feudal bureaucrats and the influential gentry and landlord class. . . . they conspired together and trumped up the charge that Cheng Pan-chiao took advantage of relief work to practise corruption and embezzlement. In handling this case the corrupt ruling class of the Ching Dynasty lent full credence to the framed-up charge of the big landlords. Faced with this situation, Pan-chiao indignantly tendered his resignation, and his superiors were only too glad to grant it. Therefore, in late autumn and early winter of the 17th year of the reign of Emperor Chien Lung, Cheng Pan-chiao was **dismissed from office.**"

"From his **dismissal from office** to his death at the age of 73, the so-called Pan-chiao style, i.e., Pan-chiao's ideas and style, became more and more ingenuous and distinctive. It was first manifested in his poetry. Here I shall quote as an example his poem written to the melody of *Chin Yuan Chun* and simply entitled 'Hatred':

*Flowers have no understanding, the moon provides no
solace, wine gives no inspiration.
I would like to fell the pretty peach trees to mar the
scenery and cook the parrot to enrich my broth.
I would like to destroy my ink slab and burn my books,
smash my lute and tear up my paintings,
Scrap all my writings and blot out every trace of my
name. . . .*

**My character is inflexible, though I am poor, wizened,
in plain garments and a straw hat.
I stay year after year in this shabby lane, the autumn
grass growing round my thatched cottage,
A light drizzle beating against the dilapidated window, a
lone lamp burning night after night.
Can it be that Heaven even gags my mouth and forbids
me to vent my hatred in a sigh or two?
Unable to contain myself, I take up a hundred pieces of
silk to paint my misery in all its detail."**

"Let me . . . in passing show you a drawing by Pan-chiao which has never been made public before. It is entitled 'Orchids and Bamboos in Remote Mountains', and was perhaps done during his magistracy in Fanhsien County. There is a poem inscribed on the painting:

**On a remote mountain precipice lonely orchids stand,
The sparse bamboo leaves rustle together with their
cool shadows,**

**I must soon doff the official's hat
So that I may come and rest carefree in their midst."**

"Evidently, he painted it when he was still a magistrate but was no longer willing to serve. The message conveyed by the painting agrees entirely with that of the poem. . . . **does not the point of the painting become clear** if we contrast the setting of the painting with the life of a bureaucrat the artist was then living?"

"As far as I know, there are still earnest students following the Pan-chiao style. But the most important point is, I think, to grasp the spirit of the Pan-chiao style. What is it? In my opinion, it is **to be one's own master in all respects and refuse to act as a menial!**"

"Pan-chiao said, 'Those who write should do so as masters, not as menials.' This is a very important remark. As a constant reminder to himself to carry this out, he specially made a seal on which were engraved the characters, 'Cheng the Master of the House'. In other words, in everything he did, **he always was his own master and blazed the trail for himself.**"

("Cheng Pan-chiao and the Pan-chiao Style", the *Kuangming Daily*, November 21, 1963)

Comment: It really is a curious coincidence. After Wu Han published his drama *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*, Teng To too suddenly felt a yearning for the ancients and wrote in memory of the dismissed official Cheng

Pan-chiao. First writing a poem in 1961 and then an article in 1963, Teng To vociferously complained on behalf of Cheng Pan-chiao who had been dismissed from office. And see how indignant and excited he was! If the reader compares this piece of Teng To's with Wu Han's drama, he will see immediately that they play the same tune on different instruments, i.e., airing grievances for the Right opportunists dismissed from office.

Teng To points out as a crowning touch that the spirit of the Pan-chiao style consists in "being one's own master and refusing to act as a menial". And he calls on people to grasp this spirit and seriously learn from it so as to "blaze the trail for oneself". How cunning and venomous! Isn't Teng To calling on people to oppose the leadership of the Party? The wide road of socialism lies bright before us, and yet Teng To calls on people to "blaze the trail for themselves". What is this trail if not the dark path leading to the restoration of capitalism?

**Acclaiming Mi Wan-chung as One Who "Was Free from
Corruption and Who Took Great Care in Dealing with
Civil and Criminal Cases", and as One Who Often
Criticized Current Affairs, Won the Praise of the
Middle and Lower Social Strata and Was
Therefore Dismissed from Office**

"Mi Wan-chung was a great scholar and a **man with backbone**. There were many things to praise in his conduct. He was born in the fourth year of the reign of the Ming Emperor Lung Ching. . . . At 25, he passed the imperial examinations for the rank of licentiate. . . . In the following year he was

appointed Governor of Kiangning. Soon afterwards, he was transferred by order to the post of Imperial Inspector of Kiangsi. He was said to be free from corruption and to take great interest in civil and criminal cases and cultural and educational affairs. Wherever he went, he won the praise of the middle and lower strata of the population and the literati."

"Mi Wan-chung was regarded by Wei Chung-hsien as a thorn in his side, because Mi always despised him and his gang and often voiced his criticism of current affairs. Ni Wen-huan, one of Wei Chung-hsien's lackeys, was particularly notorious for his incrimination of innocent people under trumped-up charges. Scores of officials were falsely accused by him; in the more serious cases, people were tortured to death, while in less serious cases they were deprived of office and their names struck off the official register. Mi Wan-chung was victimized in the latter way."

"On a piece of white silk Mi wrote a short poem entitled 'Lanko Mountain'. The calligraphy is in a flowing style completely free from academic stiffness. The poem reads:

*The sun and moon vainly busy themselves revolving
round the earth,
The Immortals who never grow old are to be envied.
While dynasties change in a single moment,
The human world still lasts longer than the world in the
grotto.*

What is the point of the poem? It obviously reflects the writer's feelings about the unpredictable political vicissitudes of the Ming Dynasty."

("The Old and Young Mi's of Wanping",
Evening Chats at Yenshan, Vol. III, pp. 39-
41; first appeared in the *Peking Evening
News*, November 9, 1961)

Comment: In this piece, Teng To again takes up Mi Wan-chung, an ancient buried in oblivion, as a pretext for complaining on behalf of the Right opportunists.

Complaining About the Injustice of Li Shan's
Dismissal from Office

"The life story of Li Shan is a sad one. Cheng Pan-chiao said in another poem addressed to him:

**Twice deprived of your scholarly rank and once demoted,
You shiver to see your thinning grey hair in the mirror.**

For a long time, Li Shan was compelled to leave the Academy of Painters at the Ching imperial court as a result of the machinations of his colleagues. He then became magistrate of Tenghsien County, Shantung Province, for a short while, was **hated by the power-wielding nobility and was therefore dismissed from office.** Afterwards, he led a vagrant life and went to Yangchow where he eked out a living by painting, thus becoming one of the eight eccentric artists of Yangchow."

"If we read Li's own poem on a scroll, we shall better understand the deep meaning of this painting. The poem says plainly:

*Yellow leaves fall from the trees around the hermitage;
The cold of the frosty dawn is not to be feared.
To paint a rooster, I would show it crowing,
To awaken the conscience of man to do good deeds."*

"The poem not only explains the significance of the painting but also reflects Li Shan's plight and his resentment and anger at the time."

("About Li Shan and His Paintings", the
Kuangming Daily, February 14, 1961)

Comment: Another case of dismissal from office! Between 1961 and 1963, Teng To complained of as many as four cases of dismissal from office and in each case sang the praises of the "rebellious spirit" of those who refused to submit despite dismissal. What "painstaking creative thinking"!

IV. ARROGANTLY SHOUTING THAT OUR PARTY
SHOULD IMMEDIATELY RETIRE AND
"TAKE A REST"

**Demanding That Our Party "Say Nothing and Do Nothing",
but Follow the "Instructions" of Teng To
and Co. in Everything**

"I would advise those friends given to great empty talk to read more, think more, say less and **take a rest when the time comes for talking, so as to save their own as well as other people's time and energy!**"

("Great Empty Talk", *Frontline*, No. 21, 1962)

"We cannot tell how such case [of amnesia] would be at its very worst — presumably it would result either in insanity or in idiocy."

"Thus if anyone finds either of these symptoms present in himself, **he must promptly take a complete rest and say nothing and do nothing**, and if he insists on speaking and acting, he will come to grief. . . . **It is imperative to follow the instructions of a competent doctor, the family of the patient must not make any decision on its own, and, in particular, the patient himself must not interfere.**"

("Special Treatment for 'Amnesia'",
Frontline, No. 14, 1962)

"It was, of course, fortunate for the titlark that it could fly away in embarrassment when its bluff was called. However, it should be borne in mind that **in other circumstances those who were deceived by charlatans will certainly not let them off lightly after calling their bluff.**"

("Two Foreign Fables", *Evening Chats at
Yenshan*, Vol. V, p. 93; first appeared in
the *Peking Evening News*, November 26,
1961)

"Chia Tao came from the prefecture of Fanyang... It belonged to the states of Yu and Yen in the periods of the Spring and Autumn Annals and the Warring States; it was a tradition in those places for brave and heroic men to express their chivalrous sentiments in stirring songs. As Chia Tao wrote in his short poem 'The Swordsman':

**For ten years I have been whetting my sword,
Its cold blade never once put to test;
In showing it to you, I ask today:
Tell me who has been wronged.**

It is obvious that the poet wrote this to voice his own feelings."

("Chia Tao's Approach to Poetic Creation",
Evening Chats at Yenshan, Vol. I, p. 16;
first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*,
June 18, 1961)

Comment: These extracts help us to see the really vicious and malevolent nature of *Evening Chats* more clearly. Teng To is not just flinging abuse at our Party and socialism; he wants to overthrow them. When he says that the so-called victim of amnesia "must promptly take a complete rest", isn't it clear that he fondly hopes to oust the Communist Party from power?

Hinting That He Is Not "a Mere Intellectual Indulging in Empty Talk" but "a Stout-Hearted Man" Who "Bravely Fights the Wicked Men in Power"

"The Tunglin scholars propagated learning in the tradition of Yang Shih;

They showed concern for everything on earth and under heaven.

Don't think of them as mere intellectuals indulging in empty talk,

Fresh were the bloodstains when their heads rolled."

**"Fighting the wicked men in power with unbending will,
The Tunglin scholars were a stout-hearted generation.
Kao Pan-lung's moral integrity shines forth in undying glory,**

Every word of his poem written on the point of death stirs the heart."

("Singing the Praises of Lake Taihu", the
Kuangming Daily, September 7, 1960)

Comment: Teng To has written much about the Tunglin Party in the past few years; he has, in particular, strongly recommended a couplet inscribed on the pillars in the Tunglin Academy, and said that the Tunglin members "had their own political objective" both in studying and in lecturing and that they all had "backbone". Obviously, there is also a "political objective" in these two poems praising the rebellious spirit of "fighting the wicked men in power with unbending will". In their anti-Party and anti-socialist activities, Teng To and his fellows try to boost the morale of their gang by invoking the Tunglin Party and playing up its rebel character.

V. EVENING CHATS AT YENSHAN ATTACKS THE PARTY AND SOCIALISM UNDER THE PRETEXT OF IMPARTING "KNOWLEDGE"

"Starting from the Tiniest Things Such as the Fly or Bedbug and Ending Up with Political Affairs" — One of Teng To's Tactics in Attacking the Party and Socialism

"*Evening Chats* has been serialized in this newspaper and said practically nothing about newspapers. Why? Is it because you take no interest in them?"

“When reproachfully questioned by some intimate friends, **I could not help breaking into laughter. What do I have to say?** Well, here by chance is a letter from a reader asking me to talk about the death of Lin Pai-shui. So an opportunity finally offers itself for me to write about the press.”

“**After the 1911 Revolution, Lin Pai-shui founded the *New Society Daily* in Peking.** In one of his articles, he wrote, ‘It would indeed be fine to have democracy in China today. However, the remnant feudal forces remain intact, and it will take 15 years of effort to uproot them.’ As someone noted, about 15 years elapsed between the time he wrote the article and the Great Revolution of 1925-27. This may just as well be credited to his ‘foresight’. However, **it was said that his articles dealt with subjects often ‘casually picked up’ and ‘started from the tiniest things such as the fly or bedbug and ended up with political affairs’ and that they showed ‘much indignation laced with humour’. They therefore especially incurred the displeasure of some of those in power.** The *New Society Daily* was once closed by official order, and when it resumed publication Lin Pai-shui announced, ‘From now on, the word “new” is removed from the *New Society Daily*, so that the name of this paper is, so to speak, beheaded as a token of self-punishment.’ This is how the *New Society Daily* became the *Society Daily*.”

(“The Death of Lin Pai-shui”, *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. V, pp. 105-07; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, August 26, 1962)

Comment: Why should Teng To, a newspaperman for a long time, “break into laughter” at the very mention of newspapers? This deserves some looking into, upon which we will discover that the reason is that he was criticized when he was running a newspaper and he harbours a grudge against the Party.

Lin Pai-shui, editor-in-chief of a newspaper he founded in Peking after the 1911 Revolution, is represented as a writer whose articles dealt with subjects often “casually picked up”, and “started from the tiniest things such as the fly or bedbug and ended up with political affairs”. Isn’t this Teng To’s confession of his own methods? What if the readers fail to see the point in the articles so “painstakingly” written up by him? So he has to drop them a hint, using a dead man as his mouthpiece, to indicate that his writings about the rooftiles, bees and other such things all “end up with political affairs”. Herein lies the key with which we should “unlock” the secrets contained in his *Evening Chats at Yenshan*.

Most of the Pieces in *Evening Chats at Yenshan* Are Full of *Double Entendres* and Have a “Political Purpose”

“*Sounds of wind, rain and reading of books all fill my ears;
Family, state and world affairs, I show concern for them all.*”

This is a couplet composed by Ku Hsien-cheng, leader of the Tunglin Party in the Ming Dynasty.”

“Why have I suddenly recalled this couplet? Chatting with some friends of mine, I found them of the view that the ancients had no political purpose in reading books, that they read only for reading’s sake and never applied their reading to anything practical. To show that this view is groundless, I quoted this couplet. Moreover, very few people are acquainted with it and there is some need to recommend it.

“The first line means that the environment of the Tunglin Academy was favourable to people’s devoting themselves to reading books. The eleven characters vividly portray the

scene in which the sounds made by wind and rain in nature are fused with the sound made by man in reading. The line makes us feel as though we ourselves were transported into the Academy and heard the scholars' reading and lecturing vying with all the sounds of nature.

"The second line means that all those studying at the Academy should show concern for politics. These eleven characters fully reflect the political ideals of the scholars of the Tunglin Party. They urged that one should not only be concerned with the affairs of one's own family, but also with the affairs of the state and the whole world."

"If we link up the two lines, the meaning stands out even more clearly: one should study hard and at the same time show concern for politics and the two should be closely combined. Moreover, **the sounds of wind and rain in the first line can be understood as a double entendre which refers both to the wind and rain as natural phenomena and to the storms of political life.** Hence, this couplet has a really profound significance.

"Judging by present-day views, we can see that **the scholars of the Tunglin Party obviously had a political purpose in their reading and lecturing.**"

"It becomes increasingly evident that one should study hard and at the same time show concern for politics. Even the ancients understood and propagated this truth. Can it be that we are inferior to the ancients and ignorant of this truth? At any rate, we should understand it more fully, more deeply and more thoroughly than they!"

("Show Concern for All Things", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. II, pp. 60-62; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, October 8, 1961)

Comment: Teng To tells us that "the scholars of the Tunglin Party obviously had a political purpose in their reading and lecturing", and that what they called the sounds of wind and rain is a *double entendre* which

"refers both to the wind and rain as natural phenomena and to the storms of political life" and has a "profound" significance. Here Teng To is owning up about his own methods.

Inciting People to Express "Dissatisfaction with Social Reality" by Using the "Technique of the Cartoon"

"The ancients already knew how to use drawing as a weapon to expose evil persons and evil deeds and praise good persons and good deeds. So drawings with the theme of the contrast between good and evil may be regarded as a kind of ancient Chinese cartoon."

"Generally speaking, however, the ancient cartoonists were not only unable critically to analyse the social reality of their times but fundamentally lacked the courage to expose social abuses. Hence, **some artists chose a subtly ambiguous form to express their dissatisfaction with the social reality of the time.**"

"The most noteworthy cartoons were undoubtedly those of the Eight Eccentric Artists of Yangchow. These artists were in fact **scholars from both the south and the north who were dissatisfied with social reality. They were angry and disgusted with society, full of grievances and out of tune with the times.** Therefore, people called them 'eccentrics', and they gladly acquiesced in the title. Animated by such sentiments, they were bound to be somewhat 'eccentric' in their drawings. Take Lo Liang-feng's works for example. . . . He liked most of all to draw ghosts and won great fame. Everybody knows that his most celebrated work was 'A Picture of the Ghosts' Fun' which may be regarded as a typical ancient cartoon."

"(We) know that his **satirical portrayal of ghosts is actually a satirical portrayal of men.** In the society of that time, if the artist had used the cartoon directly to satirize living men, he would **simply have been asking for trouble;** but, on the other

hand, if he only satirized a few ghosts, he would be quite safe. Probably it was after such practical considerations that the artist finally decided to adopt the method of drawing cartoons satirizing ghosts."

("Ancient Cartoons", *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. III, pp. 51-53; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, November 2, 1961)

Comment: Here the allusion is very clear. The "satirical portrayal of ghosts" is a "satirical portrayal of men", using the "method of drawing cartoons" to give vent to dissatisfaction with social reality. Beyond all doubt this is what *Evening Chats* does.

Beating a Temporary Retreat in an Unfavourable Situation, Decamping Being the Best of the Thirty-six Stratagems

"I have come across a mimeographed pamphlet entitled *The Thirty-six Stratagems*."

"It enumerates the 36 stratagems and, to prove their effectiveness, also cites examples of their application by ancient strategists. **Herein lies the pamphlet's value.**"

"Did anyone in ancient times ever talk about the 36 stratagems? Who first spoke of them? As far as I know . . . perhaps the earliest mention occurs in the 'Biography of Wang Ching-tseh' in the *History of Southern Chi*."

"In this biographical account in the *History of Southern Chi*, Vol. 26, we find the following passage:

The emperor was seriously ill. When Wang Ching-tseh suddenly revolted in the east, the court was shaken and terrified. The prince who was to be posthumously called the Muddle-headed Marquis was at that time heir apparent to the throne. . . . When he was told in the palace that Wang Ching-tseh had arrived, he hastily packed up to take flight. Told of this, Wang Ching-tseh commented, 'Of General

Tan's 36 stratagems decamping is the best. The only thing the father and the son can do is to flee in haste.'

"In the 'Biography of Wang Ching-tseh' in the *History of the Southern Dynasties*, Vol. 45, there is the same sentence, 'the only thing the father and the son can do is to flee in haste.' But it is immediately followed by another sentence, 'Perhaps Wang said this to ridicule Tan Tao-chi who avoided fighting against the state of Wei.'"

"Tan Tao-chi lived a little before the period of Wang Ching-tseh. He was one of the generals who helped Liu Yu, Emperor Wu of Sung, to establish his empire during the Southern Dynasties. After Liu Yi-lung, Emperor Wen of Sung, succeeded to the throne, Tan was promoted to the post of Duke of Wuling Province and given the title of Commander-in-Chief for the Conquest of the South. Leading his army against the state of Wei, he fought more than thirty battles and won them all. Later, owing to a shortage in the supply in grains and fodder, he beat a retreat by means of skilful stratagems."

"The story is given in greater detail in the 'Biography of Tan Tao-chi' in the *History of the Southern Dynasties*, Vol. 15:

As commander of the expeditionary forces, Tan Tao-chi marched northward to seize territories and fought his way to the River Chi. He defeated a strong force of the state of Wei and took Huatai. He fought more than thirty battles against the Wei troops and won most of them. When his army arrived at Licheng, it ran short of supplies and turned back. Some surrendered to Wei and told the enemy about the Sung army's shortage of supplies. All this spread worry and fear among Tan's men and their morale became low. At night Tan Tao-chi made them weigh sand and shout out the weight as if they were measuring rice and scatter what little rice was left on the sand. After daybreak the Wei troops believed that Tan's army still had enough grain

and therefore refrained from pursuit. Thinking that the men who surrendered must have told lies, they had them executed. Tan's troops were numerically inferior and had now become exhausted, and panic reigned throughout the army. Tan ordered his men to don their armour and he himself rode slowly in a chariot to the outskirts of his encampment. At the sight of this, the Wei troops suspected ambush. They dared not go near and withdrew. Although Tan Tao-chi failed to conquer the area south of the Yellow River, he returned with his army intact. This helped spread his reputation as a hero far and wide and the state of Wei feared him very much.

“Judging from this, **‘decamping is the best’ was not the only stratagem Tan Tao-chi employed; without employing other stratagems he could not have succeeded in getting away, much as he wanted to. Thanks to several co-ordinated stratagems, such as those of deceptive military deployment and sowing discord among the enemy, as a result of which the troops of the state of Wei dared not continue the pursuit, he succeeded in making good his retreat.** Wang Ching-tseh ridiculed Tan Tao-chi for avoiding the troops of the state of Wei, but as we see it today, Wang Ching-tseh's ridicule only goes to prove that he himself was no strategist.”

“After making a comprehensive study of the relevant material cited above and drawing our own conclusions, we understand the meaning of the saying: Of the thirty-six stratagems of Tan Tao-chi, decamping is the best. **If we work out the implications, is it not clear what the thirty-six stratagems are?’**”

(“The Thirty-six Stratagems”, *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, Vol. V, pp. 84-87; first appeared in the *Peking Evening News*, September 2, 1962)

Comment: “The Thirty-six Stratagems” was the last item in the series of *Evening Chats at Yenshan*. It appeared on September 2, 1962, when the Party's Eighth

Central Committee was about to convene its tenth plenary session. Seeing that the situation was getting unfavourable, Teng To acted on the saying “Of the thirty-six stratagems, decamping is the best” and duly made arrangements for retreat. To ensure safety in retreat, he had to use his wits and employ tactics. Unless he resorted to other stratagems, he could not get away, “much as he wanted to”. Teng To listed the titles of all the 36 stratagems for the benefit of his partners. So *Evening Chats at Yenshan* was for the time “discontinued”, but the Three-Family Village gangster inn carried on business as usual, conserving its strength and waiting for the opportune moment to go into action again. But whether he has 36 or 72 stratagems, Teng To will never be able to effect his get-away.

(First published in the *Liberation Army Daily* and the *Kuangming Daily* on May 8, 1966)

ON THE BOURGEOIS STAND OF FRONTLINE AND THE PEKING DAILY

BY CHI PEN-YU

The *Peking Daily* (*Beijing Ribao*) of April 16 devoted the unusually large space of three full pages to the publication, under banner headlines in big boldface, of material "criticizing" Three-Family Village and *Evening Chats at Yenshan*. This material was prefaced by an editorial note by the fortnightly *Frontline* (*Qianxian*) and the *Peking Daily*, both organs of the Peking Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China. The *Peking Evening News* (*Beijing Wanbao*) of the same day used more than three pages to print selections from this material. Such an impressive treatment has rarely been witnessed in these journals since their founding.

In the past, *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* had given space to a great many anti-Party and anti-socialist poisonous weeds. Now, if they were to make an earnest criticism of this mass of poisonous weeds and a serious self-criticism of their own errors, this would not only be necessary but also what they should do. But are *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* earnestly criticizing these poisonous weeds and making serious self-criticism by what they are doing now? No, they are not.

Have you, *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily*, criticized Wu Han?

No. You have not.

Between 1959, when Wu Han, using Hai Jui as his cover, unleashed unbridled attacks on the Party and on socialism,

and November 10, 1965, when Comrade Yao Wen-yuan published his "On the New Historical Drama *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*", more than six years had elapsed. During this long period, *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* did not print a single word exposing Wu Han. On the contrary, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* zealously published articles lavishing praise on him and on his anti-Party and anti-socialist creation, "Hai Jui". Of all the articles extolling *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*, the series of "carefully co-ordinated" writings, in which Wu Han and his cronies called each other "brother", are the most unseemly and odious.

Have you changed your attitude since Comrade Yao Wen-yuan brought up the question of Wu Han? Again, the answer is no. You did not reprint or even mention Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's important and militant article for nearly twenty days. Instead, you asked the comrades in Shanghai: "What is the background to your publication of Yao Wen-yuan's article? Why didn't you let us know in advance? What has happened to your Party spirit?"

What is the background indeed? It is the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; it is the theory concerning classes and class contradictions in socialist society which Comrade Mao Tse-tung has constantly taught us; it is the decision to unfold a class struggle throughout the country to foster proletarian ideology and liquidate bourgeois ideology, a decision announced in the communique of the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Party, which your papers, too, had published. Can it be that to wage a class struggle one must have your approval and that to do so without your approval means lack of Party spirit? Obviously, what you desire is not the proletarian Party spirit, but the bourgeois party spirit.

Under the pressure of the masses, the *Peking Daily* had to reprint Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's article on November 29,

1965. Did you then change your attitude? No, you did not. The *Liberation Army Daily* (*Jiefangjun Bao*) took a clear-cut stand in its editorial note, rightly pointing out that Wu Han's *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* was a big poisonous weed. But the *Peking Daily* in its editorial note gave neither affirmative nor negative comments on this drama. It merely said that it was "a drama of considerable influence" about which there had been "different opinions" in the past few years, and that "there should be discussions since opinions differ". In fact, you were supporting Wu Han and opposing Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's article. Neither *Frontline* nor the *Peking Evening News* reprinted it. And the *Peking Daily*, by reprinting it, was feigning impartiality in order to cover up your real attitude of partiality.

Suddenly, on December 12, 1965 both *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* prominently featured under an eye-catching headline an article signed by Hsiang Yang-sheng entitled "From *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* to the Theory of Inheriting Old Ethical Values". It looked as if you had rectified your mistakes and returned to the frontline of the socialist cultural revolution.

What is this all about?

The fact is that it was an article singing a tune in opposition to the cultural revolution. It used the tactic of "minor attack but major help" to protect Wu Han. Its central theme was the description of the "guiding thought" in Wu Han's *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* as the theory of "inheriting old ethical values". Thus in Hsiang Yang-sheng's article, a major political issue concerning opposition to the Party and to socialism became a "purely academic" question.

In addition, the author of the article defended Wu Han under the bourgeois slogan, "Before the truth all are equal." But in reality you have always taken the bourgeois stand, shielding Wu Han and other representative bourgeois figures, while gagging proletarian revolutionaries. You have always

encouraged what is reactionary and let anti-Party and anti-socialist poisonous weeds luxuriate. As for articles criticizing these poisonous weeds, you have invariably held them back and forbidden their publication. This is out-and-out bourgeois liberalization and dictatorship over the proletariat. Where can one find any equality in this?

Towards the end of his article, Hsiang Yang-sheng ostentatiously called for discussion of the so-called question of inheriting old ethical values. This was an attempt to set the keynote for the discussion of Wu Han's *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* and to turn the criticism of that drama, which concerns a sharp political issue, into a so-called purely academic question. It was learned later that Hsiang Yang-sheng was a pseudonym of Teng To, who had written anti-Party articles in partnership with Wu Han. What is more serious, at a meeting called by the *Peking Daily* on December 2, 1965, Teng To still proclaimed that "it has not yet been determined that *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* is a big poisonous weed". He added that there were errors in Comrade Yao Wen-yuan's article just as in Wu Han's.

Not long afterwards, on December 27, 1965, the *Peking Daily* published Wu Han's "Self-Criticism Concerning *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*", an article of sham self-criticism but real attack. It published the article without any editorial note and without any criticism; this amounted to supporting Wu Han in his launching of a counter-attack, in the form of self-criticism, on the comrades who had criticized him. Attention should be drawn to the fact that in his article Wu Han intimated to Hsiang Yang-sheng: Your criticism "has helped me realize my mistakes and correct my views". Having performed his task of making a counter-attack, Wu Han, following the keynote set by Hsiang Yang-sheng, published his so-called self-criticism on the question of "inheriting old ethical values" in both *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily*, in which he readily acknowledged that the "crux" of his errors was the

so-called question of inheriting old ethical values. Thus the two performed their duet in close co-ordination and perfect harmony.

One article was not enough to set the keynote. Therefore, you continued to publish articles of the same nature in quick succession, trying your utmost to turn the question of Wu Han which is an anti-Party and anti-socialist political issue into a "purely academic" question. It was for this purpose that Li Tung-shih (i.e., Li Chi, Director of the Propaganda Department of the Peking Municipal Party Committee) published his article, "A Comment on Comrade Wu Han's Conception of History", in the *Peking Daily* of January 8, 1966. It described the "guiding" thought in Wu Han's *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* as a kind of viewpoint in appraising historical characters. The same *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* was, on one occasion, interpreted as a product of "the theory of inheriting old ethical values" and, on another, as a product of a certain viewpoint in appraising historical characters. But on no occasion was it admitted to be an anti-Party and anti-socialist product.

Cheating cannot go undetected under the watchful eyes of the people. The trick of sham exposure but real support, sham criticism but real protection, sham attack but real defence, which *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* played with regard to Wu Han, was soon uncovered. Quite a number of newspapers and magazines have published articles exposing how Wu Han opposed the Party and socialism. Particularly since April, more and more people have become aware of his anti-Party and anti-socialist crimes, and his features as an anti-Party, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary intellectual have been revealed more clearly than ever before. *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News*, which have supported and shielded Wu Han, now find themselves in the awkward position of being checkmated. So you have come out half-heartedly, saying, "Wu Han is the author of two big poisonous weeds — 'Hai Jui Scolds the Emperor' and *Hai Jui*

Dismissed from Office" — and republishing Wu Han's "Chao Kuo and Ma Su" which once appeared in *Frontline*, in the hope of hoodwinking the reader with this perfunctory gesture. Such was your "criticism" of Wu Han. People can't help asking: Why do you present these well-known facts as if they were top secrets? And why don't you breathe a word about Wu Han's criminal activities, such as his faithful assumption of Hu Shih's mantle, his willing service as an American stooge and his offering of advice to the Kuomintang reactionaries?

Have you criticized Liao Mo-sha? No, you have not.

Liao Mo-sha (former Director of the Department of United Front Work of the Peking Municipal Party Committee) is the man who once anonymously and maliciously attacked Lu Hsun, the protagonist of the cultural revolution, "with a hidden arrow".¹ Now he is playing the same trick, shooting hidden arrows at the Party and the people. We would like to ask *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News*: Have you ever criticized him?

Rotten poisonous weeds have been described as fresh beautiful flowers by Liao Mo-sha. The anti-Party and anti-socialist *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office* was considered an excellent drama, and "another such drama should be written". The anti-Party and anti-socialist drama *Li Hui-niang* was described as a harmless ghost play and as "capable of inspiring the fighting spirit of the people". Have you ever criticized these writings which helped the Right opportunist, i.e., the revisionist, adverse current to rise and swell, and which spread so much filth in society?

¹ In 1934, under the pseudonym of Lin Mo, Liao Mo-sha published an article entitled "On Decorative Literature" in *Great Evening News*, in which he attacked Lu Hsun's revolutionary essays as "decorative literature". Lu Hsun returned the blow by using the same expression and named one of his own collections of essays *Decorative Literature*. See *Collected Works of Lu Hsun*, Chinese ed., People's Literature Publishing House, Peking, 1957, Vol. V, pp. 341 and 397-400.

You were fully aware that the publication of the *Stories About Not Being Afraid of Ghosts* was designed to encourage the Chinese people in their struggle against imperialism, revisionism and all reactionaries. Yet you deliberately put up a rival show in *Frontline* by publishing Liao Mo-sha's "Jokes About Being Afraid of Ghosts", which maliciously attacked the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people, maligned our great Party and people as "cowardly and stupid", "bragging" and "pressing ahead without considering the consequences", and slandered them as "braggarts who claim that they are not afraid of ghosts but are actually frightened out of their wits by them". We would like to ask: What is your purpose in publishing such rubbish? When have the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people been afraid of ghosts? Aren't your slanders against the great Chinese Communist Party and Chinese people exactly the same as those spread by the imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries of various countries?

On May 6, 1963 the *Wenhui Daily* (*Wenhui Bao*) published an article by Comrade Liang Pi-hui (the pen-name of Yu Ming-huang) criticizing Liao Mo-sha's "There Is No Harm in Ghost Plays". Shortly afterwards criticisms were published in other papers and magazines, too. You were then still unwilling to print articles criticizing Liao Mo-sha. Only later, when it became impossible for you to drag on, did you reluctantly publish Liao Mo-sha's deceptive and hypocritical self-criticism, "My Article 'There Is No Harm in Ghost Plays' Is Wrong", in order to help him out. With seeming seriousness he put a number of insignificant labels on himself, such as "forgetting the class struggle", "losing vigilance", "failing to draw a clear-cut line of demarcation", "losing my bearings", and "unconsciously lending a helping hand to the bourgeois and feudal forces in their wild assaults on the Party and socialism".

Of course, this sham self-criticism could not fool the masses. It met with serious criticisms from the readers. But

neither *Frontline* nor the *Peking Daily* nor the *Peking Evening News* paid any attention to these just criticisms. The reason was that, so far as you were concerned, Liao Mo-sha had to be put under good protection and no retreat had to be made from your anti-Party and anti-socialist positions.

In their editorial note of April 16, 1966, *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* seemed to have changed their old tune. It said: "He [Liao Mo-sha] was certainly not just 'unconsciously lending a helping hand to the bourgeois and feudal forces in their wild assaults on the Party and socialism'. He is a protagonist consciously opposing the Party, socialism and Mao Tse-tung's thought." But this label also sounds hollow. We would like to ask, what kind of person is this Liao Mo-sha? The record of his reactionary words and deeds fully shows that he is a representative of the bourgeoisie who has wormed his way into the Party. He is a bourgeois representative who speaks for the "ghosts", for the imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries of various countries and for the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists, and who has entered into an anti-Communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary united front with the foreign and domestic ghosts. You know much more than we do about his reactionary activities, but why are you unwilling to make the slightest exposure of them? Apparently you are still possessed by ghosts.

Have you criticized Teng To?

No, you have not criticized him either.

Several years ago, the Right opportunists, i.e., the revisionists, who represented the forces seeking to restore capitalism, stirred up an adverse current against the surging tide of the socialist revolution. Taking advantage of our temporary difficulties, they launched wild attacks against the Party and socialism. Teng To was an important figure in these attacks. He was the organizer and leader of Three-Family Village, the anti-Party clique of Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and himself. We know it was this selfsame Teng To who, in September

1961, personally summoned Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha to a feast in a restaurant and set up this anti-Party and anti-socialist gangster inn. It was he who gave this gangster inn its name, adopted their collective pseudonym Wu Nan-hsing and decided on the articles to be published. The history of Three-Family Village is that of sharp class struggle against the proletariat on the cultural and ideological fronts waged by Teng To and his followers Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and other anti-Party and anti-socialist representatives of the bourgeoisie.

Who is this Teng To? Investigations have now revealed that he is a renegade. During the War of Resistance Against Japan he once again sneaked into the Party. In the guise of an activist, he wormed his way into the confidence of the Party and the people, and later occupied an important post on the *People's Daily* (*Renmin Ribao*). Exploiting his position and power, he constantly distorted Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought, and promoted and propagated his bourgeois revisionist ideas. In the summer of 1957 he was an idea man on the side of the bourgeois Rightists. He made many Rightist statements against the Party and socialism. It was he who wrote the article "Abolish 'Philistine Politics'" under the pseudonym of Pu Wu-chi in the *People's Daily* of May 11, 1957, an article in which he violently attacked the Party and demanded that it hand over leadership to the bourgeois Rightists. Moreover, he actively supported the Rightists in their assaults on the Party. The ultra-Rightist Lin Hsi-ling was his closest friend. Lin Hsi-ling once called him a Chinese "unorthodox Marxist". This means that even the bourgeois Rightists knew long ago that he was a revisionist. With victory in the struggle against the Rightists, Teng To's dream of restoring capitalism was shattered. He was removed from his post on the *People's Daily* by the Central Committee of the Party. He was "dismissed from office" by the people. Shortly afterwards, he wormed his

way into the Peking Municipal Party Committee and rose again as a member of its Secretariat.

Teng To is quite well acquainted with certain tactics of struggle. The tempestuous anti-Rightist movement of 1957 made him change his methods of struggle. The spectacle of criticism and struggle waged by the broad masses of the people against the Rightists during the movement struck terror into his heart. In the new situation of class struggle he adopted more covert and cunning methods of struggle against us, instead of coming out into the open and making Rightist statements as he had done in 1957. Exploiting *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* as his strongpoints, he kept on shooting poisoned arrows at the Party and at socialism by employing ancient things to satirize the present and "reviling the locust tree while pointing to the mulberry". Among these, the most venomous were "The Family Wealth Consisting of a Single Egg", "Stories About Bragging", "Two Foreign Fables", "Three Kinds of Chuke Liang", "Great Empty Talk", "Give It Up and You Will Be on Firm Ground", "The Theory of Treasuring Labour Power", "The Way to Make Friends and Entertain Guests", "The Case of Chen Chiang and Wang Keng", "In Defence of Li San-tsai", "Kunlun Shanjen", "The Old and Young Mi's of Wanning", "Cheng Pan-chiao and the Pan-chiao Style", "Is Wisdom Reliable?", "The Royal Way and the Tyrant's Way", "On Belated Effort", "Ancient Cartoons", "The Death of Lin Pai-shui", and "Special Treatment for 'Amnesia'".

Have *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* ever criticized these poisonous weeds, these venomous attacks on the Party and socialism by the use of ancient things to satirize the present and of oblique accusations? No, not in the least.

Particular mention should be made of the ultra-reactionary essay "Special Treatment for 'Amnesia'", which is an arrow full of deadly poison directed against the beloved Central Committee of our Party. Teng To unscrupulously attacked

our beloved Party, he wanted to pour "dog's blood" over our "heads" and hit us "on the head" with a special foreign-made club to induce a state of "shock" so that "competent doctors" of his kind, namely, a handful of revisionists, could take power. This fanatically counter-revolutionary essay fully reveals the diabolical nature of Teng To and his gang of anti-Party and anti-socialist revisionists who mortally hate the Party and the people.

Teng To's wild anti-Party and anti-socialist acts aroused the indignation of numerous readers, who made stern criticisms in their letters to *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News*. However, you refused to publish any of these letters of criticism and, moreover, tried by every possible means to defend Teng To's anti-Party and anti-socialist crimes. You paid lip service to the policy of "letting a hundred schools of thought contend", but in fact you let only "one school" — that of the bourgeoisie — speak. That is to say, you alone had the freedom to oppose the Party and socialism and spread capitalist poison, while the masses of workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary cadres were forbidden to defend the Party and socialism and uproot your poisonous weeds. What you practised was out-and-out bourgeois authoritarianism and bourgeois dictatorship.

In November 1965 a drastic change took place on the front of the socialist cultural revolution. A new counter-attack began, and Teng To's collaborator Wu Han was exposed. If you had really wanted to expose Teng To from *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News*, you still had a last chance to take the initiative, and yet you failed to do so. Instead, you continued to ask Teng To to make reports and write articles in support and defence of Wu Han.

The objective class struggle exists independently of man's subjective will. The struggle steadily deepened. The true features of Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and Teng To who united in opposing the Party and socialism became fully revealed. The broad masses of readers were most dissatisfied with and

indignant at the way *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* had been sheltering Teng To and suppressing criticism, and things were inevitably coming to a head. It was only then that you hurriedly raised the question of Teng To in order to extricate yourselves from a passive position in which you had to receive blows and, even more important, the better to protect Teng To and company.

Raise the question of Teng To in order the better to protect Teng To and company — isn't this self-contradictory? No, it is not.

Didn't *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* enthusiastically publish Hsiang Yang-sheng's article "criticizing" Wu Han over three months ago in order to protect Wu Han? Raising the question of Teng To was just a repeat performance of that farce of sham exposure but real support, sham criticism but real protection, sham attack but real defence.

In their editorial note, *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* tried hard to evade the question of Teng To's attack on the Party and on socialism. Teng To, a most important figure in Three-Family Village, was given the least important place in the note. Wu Han, you said, "attacked the Party and socialism", and Liao Mo-sha was a "protagonist" against the Party and socialism, but Teng To was not anti-Party and anti-socialist. To reverse the order of importance, cover up the crucial issue and sacrifice the knights in order to save the queen — such was the tactic adopted by *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* in protecting Teng To.

In its material "criticizing" Teng To, the *Peking Daily* again made no mention of his attacks on the Party and on socialism. In the extracts from *Evening Chats at Yenshan*, which took up two full pages, only two plain and inconspicuous sub-headings at the end referred to Teng To as "Using Ancient Things to Satirize the Present". All Teng To's reactionary statements maliciously attacking the Party, the General Line, the great leap forward and the people's commune, all his articles bitterly complaining about the dismissal

and demotion of the Right opportunists, i.e., the revisionists, and concurrently about his own dismissal and demotion, were lightly dismissed by *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* as "vulgar and meaningless", "narcissistic", or, at most, "idealizing the feudal social system" and propagating bourgeois ideas.

On April 19 the *Peking Daily* distributed a "List of Suggested Topics for Articles Criticizing *Evening Chats at Yenshan*", asserting that Teng To is "an advocate of restoring what is ancient in the arts", "stands in the gallery of antiquity" and "advertises the view that the more ancient the work of art, the better". This was a continued attempt to shield Teng To by trying to lead readers to concentrate their criticism on his "worship of the ancients".

Thus the vital political issue of opposition to the Party and socialism and preparation of public opinion for the restoration of capitalism was left out.

Can this be called criticism? Is it not more accurate to call it an attempt to cover up mistakes, shield a bad element and deceive the readers?

The editorial note of *Frontline* and the *Peking Daily* says:

The lesson we have learned from this struggle is profound. As a result of our relaxation of the class struggle on the cultural and academic fronts in the past, we have given representative figures of the bourgeoisie, both inside and outside the Party, an opportunity to sneak in, to make use of the forms of academic articles and miscellaneous essays to oppose the Party and socialism, and make use of magazine and newspaper columns to open their "free markets". . . . Our magazine and newspaper published these articles without timely criticism; this is wrong. The reason is that we did not put proletarian politics in command and that our minds were influenced by bourgeois and feudal ideas, and hence in this serious struggle we lost our stand or vigilance.

Can this be called self-criticism?

"The lesson is profound." What lesson?

"Relaxation of the class struggle on the cultural and academic fronts." Was there really a relaxation?

"We have given representative figures of the bourgeoisie, both inside and outside the Party, an opportunity to sneak in and to make use of the forms of academic articles and miscellaneous essays to oppose the Party and socialism." Were you merely giving others an opportunity to sneak in and being made use of by others?

"The reason is that we did not put proletarian politics in command." If proletarian politics were not put in command, which class's politics were?

"Our minds were influenced by bourgeois and feudal ideas." Was it merely a question of being influenced by bourgeois and feudal ideas?

"Hence in this serious struggle we lost our stand or vigilance." Did you really lose your stand or vigilance?

No, everything you said is false.

For quite a long time during recent years *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily*, and also the *Peking Evening News* were themselves tools of Teng To, Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and others in launching assaults on the Party and socialism. It was not a case of their being unconsciously "made use of" by others. Far from being proletarian strongholds, your papers were bourgeois strongholds. For quite a long time Teng To, Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha and others sat comfortably in the offices of the Peking Municipal Party Committee and the Peking Municipal People's Council, lording it over others, issuing orders, faithfully carrying out the revisionist line and attempting to realize their dream of restoring capitalism through "peaceful evolution". This was in no way a case of "giving representative figures of the bourgeoisie an opportunity to sneak in". You have been waving "red flags" to oppose the Red Flag and donning the cloak of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought to oppose Marxism-

Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. You have been besmirching the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism while shouting the slogans of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. You have exploited the name of the Communist Party and usurped Party organs to oppose the Party and socialism. In the course of the bitter struggle between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism in our country, you have never relaxed the class struggle but have all along taken the bourgeois stand and waged an intense and acute class struggle against the proletariat. You have put bourgeois politics in command instead of proletarian politics. Indeed, your reactionary bourgeois ideology has been very dogged, your reactionary bourgeois stand very firm, your reactionary bourgeois awareness very sharp, and your bourgeois party spirit very strong. Until recently you have been wielding axes and chopping off all the telling points in the articles which people wrote to criticize Teng To, declaring "this is irrelevant", "that does not hold water", and "no matter what others do, we will keep to the field of academic discussion". Is this to be attributed merely to the influence of bourgeois and feudal ideas, or to the loss of stand or vigilance?

When all is said and done, sham is sham, and the mask must be stripped off. No make-up can hide ugly faces. As you have spread so much poison in the past, let loose so many evil blasts, and played so many odious tricks in resisting the cultural revolution, how can you acquit yourselves before the readers now by a few pointless words?

The time has come for *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* to undergo a thorough revolution. When the fierce ill wind raised by the class enemies at home and abroad was blowing, who was it that gave active support to Teng To, Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha in their anti-Party and anti-socialist activities? After these activities of theirs met with the counter-blows of the revolutionary masses, who was it that tried by hook and by crook to shield them? Later,

when their secrets could no longer be suppressed, who was it that directed your papers to use the subterfuges of sham criticism and "sacrificing the knights in order to save the queen"? All these are questions you cannot conceal or evade. No concealment can last long; the masses have clear eyes. If you don't make the exposure, the masses will. If you don't make the criticism, the masses will. We are convinced that all those comrades in the editorial departments of *Frontline*, the *Peking Daily* and the *Peking Evening News* who want revolution will courageously step forward, raise the red flag of Mao Tse-tung's thought, completely break with the representatives of the bourgeoisie, and boldly expose and criticize your anti-Party and anti-socialist crimes.

The organized, planned and directed anti-Party activities of Teng To, Wu Han, Liao Mo-sha, etc., should rouse us to high vigilance. The mighty revolutionary forces of socialism have swept away one group of bourgeois representatives after another, but this does not mean that henceforward all will be well. We should anticipate that more representatives of the bourgeoisie will come on the stage. The only difference is that they will use ever-changing forms in their performances. Some will come out without masks, others in some disguise; they will attack with a dispersed force at one time and with a concentrated one at another. We must take an active part in the current movement, wage a resolute struggle against the bourgeois representatives of all descriptions and carry the socialist cultural revolution through to the end.

Armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, the Chinese people are invincible. No ogres and monsters, open or hidden, in front of the scenes or behind, can stand a single blow from this mighty force. Imminent collapse is the dismal fate confronting the moribund system of capitalism. How can a few tiny mayflies topple the towering tree of socialism?

(First published in *Red Flag*, No. 7, 1966)

中国的社会主义文化大革命
(第二集)

*

外文出版社出版(北京)
1966年第一版
编号: (英)3050-1444
00044
3-E-714P