

**Yu Quan-yu,**  
**A Truly Unforgettable Committed**  
**Revolutionary in Our Era**

**By Li Zhen-cheng**

(August 17, 2010)

Sadly we heard the news that our comrade Yu Quan-yu died at 8:30 pm at his home on August 14, 2010. His death is a great loss for our Party and our people during our very complicated struggle in China and in the world at the current time.

Lao Yu was only one year older than I. I did not even know him until 1998. Shortly after 1998 the magazine *Truth and Pursuit* was shut down and Lao Yu was the chief editor of that magazine for several years. Only then did I have the opportunity to meet him and discuss important matters with him. We had private discussions in his office several times on the history of the Party , the Party building and the theories of the Party, relating to constructing a revolutionary theory.

Before I met Lao Yu I read his paper “The Main Reason for the Collapse of the Soviet Union Was not the Problem of Ethnicity before the Reform” published in the First Issue of the *Journal of China Social Science Academy Graduate Students* in 1996. I was deeply impressed by Lao Yu’s sharp analysis in that article. Then in 2003 I read his paper in another magazine, *The Pursuit of Truth*, criticizing the selling of State owned enterprises. People like to read Lao Yu’s writing because he had a lot of experiences and

he had a good memory to tell them. He possessed a lot of knowledge. His writings were based on a large body of facts he collected and were also based on solid theories. His arguments could be harsh and soft, and his language was always lively, sharp and deep. He not only expressed the firm and clear principles of the Communist Party, he also demonstrated that the strategy of the Party could be flexibly and skillfully applied. It is not an exaggeration to say that Lao Yu was one of the very few talented writers who have both intellect and courage in the current political arena.

After many in depth discussions with Lao Yu I realized that he was able to use his status as a member of the National Political Consultation and his status as the founder of China Human Rights Research Institute to engage in the complicated struggles within and outside of the Party and in and outside of China. In these struggles Lao Yu stood firmly on the side of the working class, as a good communist should. When he faced an issue he was very alert in distinguishing what was false from what was true. He was always very courageous and selfless. He regarded the interests of the Party, the nation and the people as of foremost importance without paying attention to his personal gain or loss. He fought fearlessly to uphold the high moral standard of social responsibility and our historical mission. He had been mistakenly classified as a rightist for 21 years but as far as I am concerned he was one of the firmest revolutionists on the left who deserved our admiration and reliance in our current time.

In fact it was not someone who removed the rightist hat that Lao Yu wore. Lao Yu took off his rightist hat by what he had done over a long period of time. This is a sharp

contrast to some other people, such as Li Shen-zhi and Li Rui, who now belong to the neo-liberal camp. It is questionable whether they were wrongly accused as rightists. From what Li Shen-zhi and Li Rui did in the past thirty years they have proved themselves to be the real rightists. They have regarded their personal gain or loss as of utmost importance. They have worked together with the reactionaries in China and abroad and have written articles one after another over a long period of time attacking our Party and our nation. They have used the most poisonous and destructive language to lie and to distort history of our Party and the history of the new Republic. They have repeatedly attacked and used filthy language to vilify our greatest leader, Chairman Mao Zedong. Then there are people like Liu Xiao-bo and others, who were the initiators of the “08 Declaration”, and they used the language of deep hatred to launch vicious attacks on comrade Yu Quan-yu. These attacks from the rightists and their hatred toward him actually proved that Lao Yu was in fact an unwavering revolutionary.

There were many people who were mistakenly classified as rightists in 1957 and Yu Quan-yu’s case was one of them. From the very beginning of our new People’s Republic there was the split within our Party between those who firmly believed in socialism and want to continue the revolution and those who said “goodbye to revolution”, who were in fact the rightists. Therefore, in the very beginning of the People’s Republic these two opposing sides objectively existed. That was a historical fact that is not subject to any debate. Those who said “goodbye to revolution” have showed their true selves loud and clear during the last 30 some years of Reform. After so many years both the revolutionaries and those who said “goodbye to revolution” also have their younger

followers. We used to say “the son and daughters of the revolutionaries” but this term is no longer appropriate. We should distinguish them as “the sons and daughters of revolutionaries” and “the sons and daughters of those who said goodbye to revolution.”

In my discussions with Lao Yu he told me inner news on some history of the Party that I had not known before. One of these was the direct reason behind Chairman Mao’s decision to launch the anti-rightist movement. Lao Yu told me that as a routine before Chairman Mao made any major decisions he wanted to talk to comrades in the Xinhua News agency and asked them to update him on the current political conditions. Before the launching of the anti-rightist movement, Mao met three individuals recommended by Xinhua News Agency. One of the three was Li Shen-zhi who had just returned from the United States. When Chairman Mao asked Li Shen-zhi what was his views on China’s political system. Li started to talk about the two-party political system of the United States and how these two parties taking turn to serve as president of the country. Li Shen-zh also praised the superiority of having three branches of government. Li Shen-zhi said that China should reform its current political system and adopt the political system of the United States.

The Chairman listened and began to realize the seriousness of the problem. He realized that there were people within Xinhua that took such surprisingly reactionary rightist stands on political matters, thus presenting serious threats and challenges to the authority of the Party and the people’s government. If different political parties took turns to rule the country, it would mean that the Communist Party would give up its absolute leadership in administrating the government and in commanding the military. It would

also mean that the Chinese proletariat would abandon the leadership of the country, and the consequence would be the collapse of the worker-peasant alliance, which was the basis of the democratic dictatorship of the people and the establishment of socialism. Chairman Mao saw that if this kind of rightist opinion was allowed to propagate then the country and the people would fall into the danger of losing the political security won by the blood of tens of millions of martyrs during the past one hundred years. Thus, Chairman decided that he had no choice but to lead the people in launching the anti-rightist movement.

At the start of the anti-rightist movement, Chairman Mao decided that those who had spoken and acted as rightists and also had big influence on the society should be openly named and criticized. However, they should not be arrested. They should be allowed to work without any pay cuts. Chairman Mao estimated that according to the political conditions at that time, the number of rightists criticized should be limited to 4,000 people. He was not happy when he heard that the number of people classified as rightists reached 8,000 people. He realized that the scope of anti-rightist struggle had been widened. It became obvious that different work units searched hard for rightists and many people who were merely criticizing their unit leaders were being regarded as against Party leadership and fell into the category of “rightists.” The anti-rightist movement had thus been seriously expanded and led to serious consequences. The question is who should be responsible for widening the scope of this struggle. Of course, Chairman Mao had the responsibility of the overall political struggle. However, it is extremely unfair to lay the total responsibility of widening the struggle on Chairman Mao.

In fact different levels of leadership in work units used the opportunity to attack those who had different opinions from them but were not rightists. The motive behind what they did was to secure their own political future. These people also were responsible for the widening the scope of the struggle. There is also the question whether the leadership at the Central level also intended to widen the scope of the struggle. Was it true that some leadership at the Central level actually intended to widen the scope of the struggle and classified tens of thousands of people as rightists? Was it true by doing so they could then later take off the rightist hats of these people and recruit them to their own camp? These questions can only be answered at a later day. However, Lao Yu was very pretty clear about the situation and he never blamed Chairman for his being wrongly classified as a rightist. On the contrary, he firmly raised high the flag of Mao Zedong Thought and became the toughest revolutionary soldier and strategist in our current struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Lao Yu also talked about the reasons behind the over-exaggeration during the Great Leap Forward. Once the Chairman found out the concrete situation of the over-exaggeration and blowing of the communist wind, he wanted to put a stop to it. Lao Yu said that even when the Chairman wanted to put a brake on the situation, Vice-chairman Liu continued to advocate over-exaggeration, etc. He told me the details of what happened. I wish he had written everything down. In that case, he could have helped many people to sort out the confusion and understand the true history.

Yu Quan-yu was born into an exploiting family but he grew up under the education of the Communist Party. He betrayed his own class and joined the big family of

revolution. We have no choice what class we are born into but we can choose what class we want to serve. Yu Quan-yu's life has clearly showed us exactly that. We will never forget the revolutionary spirit of Yu Quan-yu. People will follow his teaching and continue his unfinished revolution with the will of steel knowing the difficult road ahead but courageously charging forward!

## 喻权域的确是令人难忘的当代坚定革命者

已退休研究员 李振城

惊闻喻权域同志，已于2010年8月14日8:30在家病逝。这是我们党和人民在当代中国与世界对敌复杂斗争中的一大损失。

老喻只大我1岁。直到1998年之前，我还未曾与老喻相识。此后，在他担任《真理的追求》杂志主编及本杂志被迫停刊后的数年间，才有机会与老喻多次接触和交谈。其中有几次是在老喻办公室与老喻私下探讨一些党史党建和理论建设方面的问题。

我认识老喻，首先是在拜读老喻撰写的犀利文章过程中。给我印象最深的是读了老喻发表在《中国社科院研究生院学报》1996年第1期的《导致苏联解体的主因并非改革前存在的民族问题》和2000年3月在《真理的追求》上发表的《想起了“崽卖爷田不心痛”》(原国务院总理李鹏对此文深表赞赏，还亲笔批示，说此文“文风新颖，语言深刻，切中时弊。”)两篇文章。人们都爱看老喻写的文章。因为老喻经历根深，知识丰富，记性又好，善于言表，他写的文章是以大量事实、史实和充分的法理为依据的，而且刚柔并用，语言生动，文锋犀利，入木三分，既体现了共产党原则的

坚定性和鲜明性，又展现了共产党策略的高度灵活性和巧妙性。老喻不愧是我们党在当代政论文坛中不可多得之智勇双全的大将才。

经过多次的接触和深入交谈，使我更加深刻地意识到，在党内外、国内外错综复杂的政治斗争中，老喻善于利用全国政协委员的身份和中国人权研究会发起人的身份，充分展示了一位优秀共产党员所应当具有的工人阶级立场的坚定性，善于识别政治真伪是非的敏锐性，识大体，顾大局，无私无畏，不计较个人得失，以党、国家和人民的根本利益为重，力排媚外、低俗等流弊，具有高度社会责任感和历史使命感的高尚品德。因此，尽管被错划右派长达 21 年之久，而在我的印象中，老喻乃是当代中共中国里值得人们仰慕信赖的坚定革命左派的杰出代表之一。

事实表明，扣在喻权域头上的右派帽子，并不是别人在多年之后把它摘除的，而是他自己以长期多方面的革命言论行动表现，早就把那错划的右派帽子抛到九霄云外了。而与此成为鲜明对照的，却是像号称新自由主义旗手的李慎之、李锐之流，是不是当初“被错划为右派”，那就很值得人们怀疑了。因为他们在近 30 多年的言论行动，恰恰表明了他们是货真价实的真右派。他们对个人得失耿耿于怀，不惜以最恶毒的语言，编造谎言，歪曲事实，攻其一点，不及其余，与国内外反动派一道，长期连篇累牍地攻击、歪曲我们党的历史和新中国的历史，起劲地、无以复加地攻击、谩骂、丑化当代中国人民最伟大的领袖毛泽东主席。右派“08 宣言”的起草人之一刘晓波等人，无比仇恨、恶毒攻击、诽谤喻权域同志，这从反面更加证明了老喻不愧是坚定革命左派这个历史事实。

1957 年被错划为右派的优秀人才确实大有人在。喻权域所经历的怨案，就是一个典型的例子。然而自从新中国成立前后起，在我们党和革命队伍里就已经开始分化为坚持走社会主义道路的继续革命派，与主张走资本主义道路的“告别革命”派即右



派，客观上早就存在着这两部分彼此对立的派别及其代表人物，这也是不容争辩的历史事实。那些主张走资本主义道路的“告别革命”派代表人物，在近 30 多年改革开放中充分露骨的表现，还不足以更加确证这个判断所具有的客观真理性吗？老一代的继续革命派与“告别革命”派，都已陆续传帮接代。新一代干部子女，原先被统称为“革命干部子女”。现在这种称呼，已经很不适宜了，应当经过辨别，区别看待，划分为继续革命干部子女或者“告别革命”干部子女两部分。

在与老喻交谈中，老喻透露了不少党史上的内幕新闻。其中之一是 1957 年毛主席下定决心反击右派的直接导因。毛主席有一个不成文的习惯程序，就是每当做出重大决策之前，都要先找新华社的相关同志了解各方面的政治动态。在反右之前，经新华社领导推荐，毛主席与新华社的 3 位有代表性的同志交谈。其中参与交谈者之一就是刚从美国回来的李慎之。当毛主席问到对我国政治体制有什么看法时，李慎之大谈美国两党竞选轮流执政和三权分立的优越性，认为中国应当采取西方的那种政治体制，革除中国现行的政治体制。毛主席听后感到事情很严重。作为党和国家的政治窗口、政治喉舌的新华社里，就存在这样怵目惊心的右派政治思想言论，这显然是对党和国家人民政治地位的严峻威胁和挑战。因为采用不同党派竞选轮流执政的体制，那就意味着要求共产党放弃对国家行政和军队的绝对领导权，要求中国工人阶级放弃对国家的领导权，从而导致工农联盟瓦解，破坏工人阶级领导的以工农联盟为基础的人民民主专政这个社会主义的基本政治制度。如果容许这种右派言论扩散开来，势必会危及到经过百多年数千万烈士鲜血换来的党和国家人民政治的安全。因此，这迫使毛主席下决心领导人民开展反击右派的斗争。

当反击右派斗争开始后，毛主席认定对那些右派言行确实，且社会影响很大的右派代表人物，可以点名批判，扣上右派分子的帽子，但不要抓起来管制，还要适

当安排工作，一般不要减薪。根据当时的全国政治形势，内部掌握的右派代表人物，控制在 4000 人左右为宜。当毛主席听取执行领导反右斗争的中央领导同志汇报，被定性为右派分子者已达到 8000 人时，毛主席很不高兴，明确要求防止斗争扩大化。可是实际上，当时已经存在层层加码寻找斗争对象，以致把对单位领导有意见也被看成是反对党的领导，被确定为“右派分子”等反常现象，从而导致反右斗争严重地扩大化了。当时反右斗争是非常必要的，只是导致反右斗争扩大化，造成了许多严重的不良后果。那么，谁应当为这种斗争扩大化的历史错误负责呢？当然，毛主席应当负总的政治责任。可是，把责任全推到毛主席身上，显然是极不公平的。事实上，当时各级领导机关的领导层中，都不同程度地存在着乘机打击、排斥与己有不同意见而并非右派的人士，来确保自己或小集团的政治地位和升迁的政治动机，他们都负有不可推卸的责任。至于中央领导层中是不是也存在着怂恿斗争扩大化，以便毛主席百年后，再亲自摘去被划为右派的数万人的右派分子帽子，把其中的大多数人士作为推行另一条政治路线的社会政治支柱的意念？这只能留待后人去评判了。对于这种政治内幕，老喻是早有觉察，心中有数。所以，他并不因自己的怨情而责怪毛主席，而是坚定地高举毛泽东思想的伟大旗帜，成为与当代资产阶级进行政治斗争中的革命尖兵和谋士。

老喻还讲过 1958 年大跃进的起因、毛主席首先发现浮夸风，要求立即煞住浮夸风、共产风和瞎指挥风的具体情节。他还说过，当毛主席要求煞住浮夸风时，刘副主席等还在继续倡导浮夸等等情节。要是老喻留有这方面的遗稿就好了。这可以帮助人们搞清许多被炒作弄得模糊不清的历史真相。

喻权域出身于剥削家庭，但是从小就在党的培育下成长，早已背叛了剥削阶级，投入革命大家庭的怀抱之中。出身不由己，道路可选择。这在喻权域的身上得到了

充分的体现。喻权域仙逝后，喻权域的革命精神将会令人永久地难以忘怀。后人必将会继承喻权域的革命遗志，百炼成钢，继续战斗，知难而进！

( 2010 年 8 月 17 日 )