

TRANSLATIONS ON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

No. 300

CONTENTS

PAGE

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL

Taiwan Journal Publishes 'Secret' Speech by Wang Hung-Wen (CHUNG-KUNG YEN-CHIU, 28 Dec 74)	1
Services Offered by Shanghai Library (NCNA, 11 Dec 74)	18
Briefs	
Progress of a Honan Labor University	20
Minority-Nationality Cadres in a Hupeh County	20
Reform of Opera Songs in Kwangtung	21

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL

Shanghai Hospital Runs Medical School (Shanghai City Service, 9 Dec 74)	22
Briefs	
Tsinghai Medical Students	24

TAIWAN JOURNAL PUBLISHES 'SECRET' SPEECH BY WANG HUNG-WEN

Taipei CHUNG-KUNG YEN-CHIU (Studies on Chinese Communism) in Chinese
Vol 8, No 12, 28 Dec 74 pp 93-100

[Text] (Editor's note: Presented below is a most important Chinese Communist document titled: "A Report by Wang Hung-wen to the 'Central Read and Study Class'" which was procured on the mainland by the parties concerned. Wang Hung-wen is vice chairman of the CCP Central Committee and one of the leading figures of the Cultural Revolution faction. Even though his report was published on 14 January 1974--prior to the mass anti-Lin Piao and Confucius campaign--nevertheless its contents do shed light on the overall political situation on the mainland prior to the campaign and on the complexity of the power struggle within the party and the reasons for launching the campaign. The speech is published here expressly for those scholars who are engaged in the study of the problems on the mainland.)

I will go over the problems of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution [hereafter GPCR]. We recently have encountered the following situation: In some provinces, big, difficult and longstanding problems have gone unresolved, the principal one being failure to comply with the line. Now in some areas, aside from a small number of bad individuals, most of this has been attributable to the line of the leaders. They have not implemented it correctly, principally because they have handled the GPCR, the masses and the movement incorrectly. The initial shock, as in the case of the 12 factories in Szechwan, was quite a problem, yet a problem of a general nature, one which I will cover here today, with the hope that it will serve to get everyone to review [Chairman] Mao's directives issued since the start of the GPCR. Our comrades are currently studying the salient points of Mao's five most recent directives and those of the New Year's Day editorial by the JEN-MIN JEN-PAO, HUNG-CH'I and the CHIEH-FANG KUN PAO, which have covered this problem. So there is good reason to take some time to study and discuss the problems of the GPCR.

1. Why must we correctly acknowledge the real significance of the GPCR? We must do so because the GPCR was a significant event related to the

consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the prevention of the restoration of capitalism. As all of you know, the GPCR was written into the political reports issued by the 9th and 10th party congresses, as well as the party constitution. The matters on which decisions were made at the party congress should be observed and executed by all of the members of the party. The new year has begun. The national and international situation is quite good. Insofar as the revolution is concerned, the situation is very good--a truly excellent situation overall. We must develop the excellent situation and do a good job in managing our internal affairs and lay a solid foundation. Should we desire to solve some of the problems in the cities and provinces, we first must solve the problems related to the line; and in handling these problems correctly, the foremost thing we must do is deal correctly with the problems of the GPCR. Defending the GPCR is tantamount to defending Mao's revolutionary line. Each of us members of the communist party, especially the middle level cadres, should shoulder this task even more so.

So as to understand fully the great importance of the GPCR, the first thing we must do is restudy Mao's important directives pertaining to the GPCR. This is our key to understanding the GPCR. There are some individuals at present who have forgotten Mao's directives. There are still a small number of districts which continue to practice dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

As early as the end of 1964, when the GPCR was just getting underway, at a time when the play "Hai Jui Dismissed From Office" was being criticized, Mao pointed out: "The issue at point in 'Hai Jui Dismissed From Office' is dismissal from office. Emperor Wan Li dismissed Hai Jui from office, and in 1959 we dismissed P'eng Te-huai from office. P'eng Te-huai was another Hai Jui." This clearly shows that the GPCR was a great political revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. It was by no means a simple academic debate. In the early period of the movement, some people fell into this trap and thought it was an academic debate. In fact, under the direction of Liu Shao-ch'i, P'eng Chen and company burst forth, dishing out the revisionist "February Outline" which was really aimed at protecting the rightists and striking at the leftists, and vainly attempted to guide the movement onto the bourgeois track of pure academic discussion. Mao resolutely had P'eng Chen and company step aside and at the same time pointed out that the old Propaganda Department was the palace of the King of Hades and that it was necessary to "overthrow the King of Hades and liberate the little devils." As Mao has said, we have long advocated that once the central organs begin doing bad things, we will summon the country to arise and attack the Central Committee. "Doing bad things" here means instituting revisionism. In Hangchow Mao once asked Comrade Hsu Shih-yu: "What would you do if the Central Committee began proceeding along revisionist lines?" Mao has repeatedly discussed this question. In May 1966, Mao personally sponsored and initiated the "16 May" circular which served as a program document for the GPCR. In this document Mao set forth many important directives. Mao pointed out: "Those representatives of the

bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the party, the government, the army and the various spheres of culture are a pack of counterrevolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Some of them we have already seen through, others we have not. Some are still trusted by us and are being trained as our successors--persons like Khrushchev, for example, who are still nestling beside us. Party committees at all levels must pay full attention to this matter." This directive has already been published. It is a most important directive. Yet at the 9th and 10th party congresses there were some who forgot its contents and some who failed to recognize the existence of capitalist roaders.

In response to Mao's call, the broadly based revolutionary masses plunged themselves into the Cultural Revolution. This threw Liu Shao-ch'i and company into a panic, and Liu Shao-ch'i hastily concocted a bourgeois reactionary line and personally suppressed the revolution. At this key moment, Mao personally convened the 11th Plenary Session of the Eighth Party Central Committee, drew up the 16 Articles and studied my big character poster entitled "Bombard the Headquarters." And so the sweeping GPCR got underway. Mao made a lofty appraisal of the GPCR, pointing out that the great magnitude of the GPCR had positively aroused the masses and would have a profound significance with respect to the revolutionizing of the thinking of our nation's people. Mao issued a call: "You must concern yourselves with the great tasks of our country and carry out the GPCR to the very end." Mao incited revolutionary youths to face the world and brave the storm during the course of the GPCR and to temper themselves, becoming successors to the cause of the proletarian revolution during the struggle. At this time Mao also showed concern for the broad masses of cadres and warmly directed them: "You should put politics in command, go among the masses and join in with them in making the GPCR a success." Mao sincerely hoped that the older generation of proletarian revolutionists would uphold this advanced phase of the revolution and render new meritorious services during the GPCR.

By the end of 1966, the GPCR manifested an excellent situation. With the approach of 1967, Mao, on 26 December, discussed "the launching of a class struggle throughout the nation and on all fronts" (Editor's note: The text at this point has: "launched next year simultaneously throughout the nation and on all fronts"), which involved usurping power from a small band of capitalist roaders holding positions of power within the party. As early as November 1966, Mao resolutely supported the movement by the Shanghai workers in rebelling against the bourgeoisie. When the movement took place, Mao was elated. The 16 Points state: "The young are the pathbreakers of the GPCR; the workers, peasants and soldiers are its main force." Comrade (Chang Ch'un-ch'iao) of the central leadership was dispatched to Shanghai to support the workers' movement, and manage the An-t'ing affair and endorse the revolutionary rebel organization established by the workers themselves. [As stated in] Mao's directive: "It is

permissible to take action first and report to one's superiors later," which is to say, the event precedes the concept. At the end of 1966, Mao again stated in a directive: "There is great hope for Shanghai: the workers, students and organ cadres there have all arisen." Under the leadership of Mao's warm-hearted care and the proletarian headquarters headed by Mao and supported by the PLA stationed at Shanghai, there erupted a struggle to seize power from the hands of a small band of capitalist roaders within the party.

This was not a matter which involved Shanghai alone but one which involved the entire nation. If it had not been Mao and the Party Central Committee who seized power, it never would have been seized. On 16 January 1967, Mao presided over a meeting of the Standing Committee and enthusiastically endorsed the struggles for power from below. With respect to the power seizures involving WEN HUI PAO and CHIEH-FANG KUN PAO, he made a lofty assessment of the situation. He pointed out that this is a great revolution, a great revolution involving the overthrow of one class by another. This affair provided a major stimulus to the expansion of the GPCR in eastern China as well as in the provinces and cities throughout China.

On 26 January Mao issued another great call to the people, "The PLA should support the leftist masses." Mao further summarized the basic experiences of those engaged in the struggle to seize power. Mao said: "Let the revolutionary faction of the proletariat unite and seize power from the small band of capitalist roaders within the party." He pointed out, moreover, that in those areas and units where seizure of power was necessary, the aim of those involved should be to implement the three-way alliance of the revolution and promote the establishment of temporary revolutionary organs which are revolutionary, representative and based on proletarian power. These organs were called "Revolutionary Committees." In January, power was seized in Shanghai. While combating the evil winds of counterrevolutionary economism, the Party Central Committee, the Military Commission of the Central Committee, the Cultural Revolution Group of the Central Committee and the State Council sent a congratulatory telegram in which they indicated a desire to place the fate of the GPCR and of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the hands of the proletariat.

During August and September of 1967, while inspecting the three major regions [of the country], Mao made a most important observation concerning stepping up the expansion of the GPCR. Mao elatedly pointed out: "The GPCR situation throughout the country is excellent, not bad. The situation as a whole is better than at any time in the past."

At the high tide of the GPCR, Mao far-sightedly pointed out, "The present Cultural Revolution is the first of its kind. Many more should be promoted hereafter. Who wins and who loses in the Cultural Revolution will be decided by history. If it is badly implemented, the revival of capitalism at any time will lurk as a possibility. No party member or person in this country should think for one minute that after having one, two,

three or four cultural revolutions they can then take it easy. By no means should we ever let down our guard."

Comrades, let us think back for a moment. These directives of Mao were most important. That was the time of the ninth line struggle, which was followed by a tenth. When reading these directives at the time, it was often the case that we failed to grasp their meanings and did not read them with comprehension. It was only with the passage of time that we began to comprehend them. We have a need to study these directives. They are very important insofar as raising our consciousness of class struggle is concerned. The Central Committee has recently collected Mao's directives pertaining to the GPCR and published them as a book. Only when Mao's directives are understood will we be able to discern Marxism from revisionism, which in turn will benefit the expansion of the struggle against revisionism. Why do I bring this up? The primary reason is that there are still some comrades in the party who do not understand this.

2. The great victory of the proletariat. From the series of directives discussed above, it is plain that Mao has initiated and led this cultural revolution with a great deal of determination. At present this revolution has attained immense victories. In the first place it brought about the destruction of the bourgeois headquarters headed by Liu Shao-ch'i. This was a major victory. The Cultural Revolution at one and the same time has tempered the broad masses of cadres as well as the masses of people and it has brought about a revolution in the superstructure and greater production in industry and agriculture, greatly facilitating the liberation of production power. While numerous comrades have witnessed this, a small number have failed to comprehend it. This was a movement which quickly manifested Marxism, Leninism and Mao [Tse-tung] Thought on a wide scale. This movement is proceeding deeply throughout the country. Practice over these last 8 years fully substantiates Mao's directive: "The current GPCR is absolutely necessary and most timely for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, preventing capitalist restoration and building socialism." If we had not had this Cultural Revolution, what would the situation in our country be like at this moment? The Central Committee has recently prepared some materials (Lin Piao and the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius) for distribution throughout the party for purposes of criticism. Lin Piao and his wife, Yeh Ch'un, along with the likes of Ch'en Po-ta, all had an intense hatred of socialism. This prompted discussions among those of us working there, and we became very angry. With respect to this phase of the Cultural Revolution, our class enemies inside and outside of the country quite naturally attacked us in every conceivable way. This is not at all strange. Chiang [Kai-shek] also has cursed the Cultural Revolution. The Soviet revisionist news services have been reviling it for 7 or 8 years now. In his "571" counterrevolutionary outline for staging a coup d'etat, Lin Piao employed the language of the Soviet revisionists to curse us. Yet as Mao has said, "To be attacked by the enemy is not a bad thing but a good thing." This proves that our handling of the GPCR was correct. The more deeply we

criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, [the more] Chiang, the South Koreans, the South Vietnamese and the Soviet revisionists curse us. From a class viewpoint, this situation is not abnormal. The problem is that within our own ranks, including people inside and outside of the party, some comrades even today are still no different than 7 or 8 years ago when they did not understand [the Cultural Revolution], did not take it seriously and did not work hard for it. Some are even confusing right and wrong, calling black white and describing the Cultural Revolution as all black, likening it to a flood of wild beasts. Some have said that once started, the Cultural Revolution was enough to make one's hair stand on end. In the Party Constitution adopted at the 10th party congress, the Party Resolution states that cultural revolutions will be repeated many times in the future. Some have said that the Cultural Revolution was entirely unnecessary and should not be repeated again. Especially among the upper and middle level cadres, one hears all sorts of things. Some say, "While great victories have been realized from the Cultural Revolution, we cannot see the victories from where we are." This is to say that the victories cannot be seen from any place, the sum total being that they cannot be seen anywhere in the entire country. So then what need was there for it? As stated earlier, the Cultural Revolution brought down two bourgeois headquarters. This was a great victory. How can anyone fail to see it? Whoever says that he cannot see it is placing himself outside of the party and the masses. If Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao and company had seized power, capitalism would have been restored and Chinese society would have reverted to a feudalistic, semi-colonial society, subsequently becoming a colony of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, with the heads of millions falling to the ground. If this had happened, would you still say that you could not see it? We say that the Cultural Revolution was necessary and timely not only for the whole country but for each factory, school and unit. Mao has said, "The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." The lines of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao influenced these units but only to varying degrees. Mao's revolutionary line prevailed in most localities. In some localities the revisionist line was fairly well-entrenched, as in the case of the old Propaganda and Organization Departments. These two important organizations were not under our control. Not to mention the cultural front where the bourgeoisie had exercised leadership for many years, the influence of the revisionist line on the industrial front has run very deep. The situation after the Cultural Revolution improved considerably. If control of the factories by the experts along with their regulatory, repressive, slavish compradore philosophy is not eliminated, how will the members of the working class ever become the masters of the factories? It has been due to disturbances caused by the revisionist line that our steel [production] has lingered on for 10 years. Some enterprises are in our hands only in appearance. In essence they are in the hands of the agents of the bourgeoisie. Some are even in the hands of capitalists (Some of the plants in Shanghai are actually run by capitalists). Should we not have such a revolution in these units, what would happen? How would we be able to place the powers of leadership in the hands of the proletariat? Mao

farsightedly launched a cultural revolution in order to solve this problem. But even this one was not enough. At present, in some units in various cities and provinces, the key issue is one of leadership. The masses cannot be blamed. We cannot say that the masses are bad. This is not to say, of course, that all of those concerned are bad. Some are good men, but their thinking is revisionist and capitalistic. Should we point this problem out to them one day, these comrades will change for the better. Some 7 or 8 years have elapsed since the beginning of the Cultural Revolution. The problems in some localities should have been solved already. If one wants to solve a problem, the first thing he must do is find its source. Only by doing so will the right remedy be found. Some people cannot make a distinction between good and bad and attribute the bad things in a unit to the Cultural Revolution, or they regard these bad things as the hereditary diseases of the Cultural Revolution. This is wrong. They are the hereditary diseases of revisionism. How can they be regarded as the hereditary diseases of the Cultural Revolution? This goes to show that launching the Cultural Revolution was absolutely necessary. Those localities where the line has not been properly [implemented] have not been able to unite and the broadly based cadres and masses have uncovered bad individuals. Some have not done a good job in criticizing Lin Piao and Confucius. Recently we solved the problem in 12 factories in Szechwan. What was the problem? The problem was that the criticism of Lin Piao had not been carried out in depth. We believe that all problems can be solved, provided we do things in the spirit of the Cultural Revolution. The Tatung tank factory had some problems for several years. This time they were solved in 2 months. The main thing is that a wrong line was implemented there. Naturally we do not deny the fact that in some individual units there were some troublemakers. It was necessary to arouse the masses to isolate these people. Regarding all problems as hereditary diseases of the Cultural Revolution means to practice what prevailed before the Cultural Revolution. Things will become even worse. At a cadres meeting held in Kiangsi Province, some persons spread the counterrevolutionary sayings: "Sweep the temple clean in order to usher in the true god" and "Old marshals should return to their original positions and the rank-and-file soldiers to their camps," in an attempt to oppress all rank-and-file soldiers. Recently I saw a cable saying that the rank-and-file soldiers there have all rebelled and have harassed two leaders, placing them under duress but not breaking them. This is a truth [i.e., a natural outcome given the situation in the place in question]. I told some comrades from Kiangsi: you people are trying to reverse the verdicts of the Cultural Revolution. I told them this before the 10th party congress but to no avail. I told them again during the 10th party congress but again to no avail. Yet there is no need to worry, the Central Committee is aware of this matter. (Editor's note: Not one of the above is of respectable ability [reference uncertain, tr.]).

There are also those who say that the Cultural Revolution was all well and good but wonder whether it was really necessary to launch it in such a fashion. In other words, we should not use the four great weapons and not

arouse the masses to air their views freely, write big-character posters and hold great debates. They do not approve of the limitless revolutionary masses or a unified proletariat seizing power from those in power within the party who are taking the capitalist road. The point here is this: by negating all of this, we in turn negate the GPCR. In a talk by Mao in 1967, he pointed out: "In the past we initiated struggles in the countryside, in the factories and in the cultural realm. We promoted socialist education movements. We still were not able to solve our problems, because we had not found a method--a method which was open and all-embracing, motivating the masses from top to bottom and exposing our dark side. We now have found such a method, namely, the GPCR." To tell the truth, were it not for the Cultural Revolution, how could we ferret out those well-hidden renegades like Liu Shao-ch'i? In the past, we were completely unaware of Liu Shao-ch'i's actions as a renegade, his crimes and his historical background. They were discovered by the Red Guards who checked everywhere during the Cultural Revolution. (Of course, we already recognized the revisionist trash he openly peddled.) At the same time, had the Cultural Revolution not been carried out in such a fashion, how would it have been possible to discover those new emerging things such as the revolutionary committees, the 7 May cadre schools and the educated young people settling in the countryside? It would have been impossible to do so. Nor could agricultural production have been expanded so quickly. Had we not had a mass movement on so large a scale as that of the Cultural Revolution, the dissemination of Marxism and Mao Thought would not have been possible. Of course, the Cultural Revolution was a new born thing which underwent a process of development and perfection within itself. Mao has pointed out: "An historical experience worth noting is that a line and a point of view have to be discussed over and over again. Discussing them with only a few individuals is not enough. They have to be made known to the masses." In some places at present, the directives of Mao and the Central Committee have been blocked by certain individuals, preventing them from being passed on to the masses. Sometimes the masses are given directives without being told which of them have been issued by Mao, which of them have been issued by the Central Committee and which of them have been issued by the individuals themselves.

Some individuals, when "praising" the Cultural Revolution, say that during the Cultural Revolution the masses were disobedient; they wrote big-character posters without good reasons; and everyone talked at the same time during meetings. Was this at all correct? In actuality this was a victory of the Cultural Revolution.

Mao has long pointed out, "Our party has got to be lively and fresh and not so moribund." Mao once told Wang Hai-jung: "Students can doze off or read novels in class." Some people do not understand this. My understanding of this is that students should not be bored to death, rather they should be encouraged to dare to rebel against revisionism.

In the units [of the PLA] there also exists the question of unconditional obedience vis-a-vis absolute obedience. Yet obedience is conditional, not unconditional. Those [orders] which are compatible with Marxism and Mao Thought should be obeyed; those which are not should be opposed. In carrying directives issued from the upper levels, we members of the communist party do so with an awareness that we must comply with the line and carry out correct lines and correct orders. Incorrect ones should not be carried out. Some people are displeased with this idea, saying that it is difficult to control those fighters who love to offer opinions. This is natural. Presently, political incidents often occur mainly because rude actions are taken to control these fighters, rather than doing deep-going, meticulous political work. As a result, problems have cropped up and contradictions have sharpened. The key problem here is also one of line, as in the case of dealing with the masses. The situation has now developed [to the point] that we must study our ideological work and the ways of doing it. Using only those of the past will never do.

We regard this as something good. Some people think otherwise. In a socialist country such as ours, the workers, peasants and soldiers are the masters. This point should not be forgotten. This was pointed out in the report of the 10th party congress. We must have a revolutionary spirit of daring to go against the tide, such as that of the two young students reported in the papers lately--one named Huang Shuai and the other from Kwangtung. They started out by writing a letter to the JEN-MIN JEN-PAO, seeking support. The things they wrote were on the level and quite moving. In our view they should be supported.

Mao recently issued the instruction: "Why does an ox have two horns? They are used for struggle." He had already made this statement in 1955. Mao also has instructed us: "We are all communist party members. Why do we beat around the bush? It is necessary to talk less and criticize more. We must rely on our horns, the pair of horns on our head, the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers who dare to oppose the revisionist line." Some units fear the use of the "four great weapons" mentioned in the report delivered at the 10th CCP National Congress. They are scared to death. Up to now they have not dared to arouse the masses to study this report. When the masses arise to wield the "four great weapons" and go against the tide, we should give our approval. What have we got to fear? Only those who are revisionists are afraid to wield the "four great weapons." Whoever are Marxists and Leninists should support the revolutionary rebellious spirit of the revolutionary masses. Mao has instructed us: "If we do not even fear the imperialists, why would we on the other hand begin to fear the people? Those who fear the people, who believe that the masses are unreasonable, who can only coerce, who cannot persuade, these type of people are not true communist party members, are not true communists." Some people cannot accept this statement of Mao; they are inclined only toward suppression, and if they cannot suppress, they make arrests.

Some people have said: "Veteran cadres won one victory after another in the past, but they were repeatedly struggled against in the GPCR." This is wrong, and does not coincide with the true feelings of the old cadres. One should say that the old cadres are the precious treasured wealth of the party, they won one victory after another in the past, many of them were wounded, but they did not think that because of this they could divorce themselves from the masses, that they could put on the airs of an official, rather, they actively took part in the cultural revolution; when they discovered their own personal faults and errors, they undertook self-criticism. They made a contribution to the GPCR. There were not just one or two such old cadres, there were many of them. These are the true representatives of the older generation of proletarian revolutionaries. As to the accusation that some of the cadres came under attack quite frequently during the GPCR, this must be analyzed in concrete terms. Mao said, during his inspection of the three major regions: "Why did some cadres come under the criticism and attacks of the masses? One reason was that they carried out the bourgeois reactionary line and the masses were angered; another was that they became big officials, got large salaries, considered themselves something special, put on airs, did not discuss problems with the masses, did not treat people equally, were not democratic, liked to lecture people, liked to curse them, and were divorced from the masses. Under these circumstances, the masses had their just grievances, but normally, had no outlet for expression. Then the GPCR erupted, and when it did, all hell broke loose, and they found themselves in desperate straits." Cannot these people Mao mentioned be criticized? If you can lecture other people, why can the masses not give you some criticism? Everyone is already familiar with these instructions of Mao, but some people have forgotten that. As for those veteran cadres who found themselves in desperate straits, the principle "one divides into two" applies to them. Some of them, taking the positive view, accepted the lessons of experience and became the veteran cadres who were wholly trusted by the masses. There were a lot of these cadres, like Comrade Ma T'ien-shui of Shanghai, who had had a complete change of heart by the end of the GPCR, who were going down among the masses in even better ways, who were implementing the line properly. On the other hand, there were those who took the negative view in summing up their experiences, and who, in facing the masses, tried to straddle the fence, who were timid and indecisive, and who in reality were still divorced from the masses, although they might on the surface seem to be just the opposite.

There were those of yet another type who never gave the slightest thought to the overthrow of the two bourgeois headquarters during the GPCR, and its influence upon the course the nation would take, and who have never forgotten the masses' attacks against them. After being liberated, and allowed to take office again, the minute they have the opportunity they sought to settle accounts with the masses. The Kiangsi cadres were like this. The results of such actions, however, were that the "accounts" invariably settled on their own heads; those who put on "the three airs" and did not change always had their downfall. If this problem is not

corrected, those who are liberated now will still have to be overthrown in the future.

Some people have said: "I was dragged out and struggled against during the GPCR; this is a debt somebody must pay, and they'll be lucky if I don't demand interest. What is wrong with venting one's anger?" We should shout at these comrades that this is too dangerous! What debt do the masses of people owe you? Mao asked: "Who gave us the authority we have? The working class gave it to us; the poor and lower middle peasants gave it to us; over 90 percent of the broad masses of the laboring people gave it to us. We represent the proletariat. We represent the masses of the people. If we overthrow the enemy of the people, then the people will support us." "The most fundamental principle of the communist party is that we rely directly on the revolutionary masses of the people." If you insist on extracting a payment from the masses, the masses have the authority to take your power away from you.

There is another tendency, and that is to consider Lin Piao's revisionist line as being ultra-"leftist" in essence. Actually, Lin Piao's revisionist line is ultra-rightist in essence, and not ultra-"leftist." It was as far right as it could be. Not long ago someone in a university said: "It is impossible to distinguish right from wrong if the ultra-'left' is not criticized." The greatest proof of this is: who passes judgment on the merits or demerits of the past 17 years? The judgment has already been handed down. All those big-character posters of the GPCR stated the judgment; the minutes of the resettled youth educational work conference of the Central Committee have already handed down the judgment. This is to say that for the past 17 years, Mao's line, basically, simply has not been implemented on the educational front. The front has been usurped by the revisionists. The letter of Mao to Chiang Ching stated: "Peking University and Tsinghua University have deep-rooted, long-standing, complicated and serious problems." Now some people say that the "minutes" are no longer relevant, are a product of an ultra-leftist trend of thought, and spread such sayings everywhere. As far as some people are concerned, criticism of the ultra-"left" and the criticism of Lin Piao are false and only criticism of the GPCR is true. Our conclusion is that "It is impossible to distinguish right from wrong if ultra-rightists are not criticized." At present, to consolidate the achievements of the GPCR, we must criticize the ultra-right essence of Lin Piao's revisionist line. If we do not criticize the ultra-right essence of Lin Piao's revisionist line, it is absolutely impossible to consolidate and develop the tremendous achievements of the GPCR.

Last year there was an article studied by a certain unit claiming that the young people in that unit were ultra-rightists, that they could do nothing correctly, and that they were all bad. If this is true, on whom shall we pin our hope for China's revolution? Who will be our successors? The instruction of the CCP Central Committee on the convocation of CYL congresses at the provincial level pointed out that the majority of young

people are good. If this were not the case, there would be no future for our revolutionary cause, the glory would be gone. It should be noted that counterrevolutionary rumors are being spread in some localities, such as "sweep the temple clean, usher in the true god, old marshals return to their original positions, and the rank-and-file soldiers go back to their camps." The crux of this matter is in the final two sentences: "old marshals return to their original positions, rank-and-file soldiers go back to their camps." These implied that all renegades, special agents and capitalist roaders were to be reinstated, and even Liu Shao-ch'i were to be invited back, and that all the newborn things which have emerged during the GPCR were to be thrown out. This is typically restoration of the old, or restoration of capitalism. It may also be regarded as an attempt to counterattack and turn the tables. This rumor was spread by two high-ranking cadres of the army. It was very bad to spread such things. For instance, the Liu Shao-ch'i counterrevolutionary rumor was taken as Mao's instruction in Kiangsi Province and was read to a meeting of a million cadres. This is not surprising. The reason was that some of our cadres have a rumor mill in their heads. When a rumor reached them, they grinded it out immediately. Viewed from a class standpoint, this is not unusual either.

Some people, although basically good, have long been unarmed ideologically, and are incapable of distinguishing fragrant flowers from poisonous weeds. Mao severely criticized this counterrevolutionary rumor and changed it to: "Sweep the temple clean, usher in a true god, old marshals return to the front lines, and the rank-and-file soldiers should be promoted." Mao's instruction fully embodied the revolutionary line on the question of cadres. We should make full use of the older proletarian revolutionaries. This is of the utmost importance. At the same time, we must expend great efforts to nurture the successors to the proletarian cause--and not just a few, but hundreds of millions of them. To not make full use of the old cadres is a mistake. However, it is also wrong to evaluate a veteran cadre in terms of his seniority instead of his performance in the present-day class struggle. The fact that they are veterans who participated in the wars and struggles of the past is very important, but it is even more important to evaluate their consciousness and performance in the present-day class struggles. If their ideology is revisionist, can they possibly fight well for the proletariat? It is our belief that, especially in critical times, cadres should not be evaluated only by looking at their background. It is necessary to look at their present performance. Primary attention should be paid to their awareness of the line struggle. No matter if they are local or army cadres, whether new or old, they should all be thusly evaluated.

If an old cadre is in error, he should be first observed and then helped, and be allowed to correct his mistakes. New cadres should be treated the same. However, in some localities now, errant veteran cadres are watched and helped and allowed to atone for their wrong doings, but new cadres found to be delinquent are finished off with one blow. Why is it that

errant veterans can be educated, while errant new cadres cannot be educated and are shot down? This is not fair! It is not helping party unity! Mao criticized the great many people who looked down on the Children's League saying: "You get to be teenagers or in your twenties and think you're so great!" Now the new cadres have to be modest, prudent, not conceited or self-complacent, or cocky, should respect the veteran cadres and learn from them. The veteran cadres should teach, help, and take the lead; the new cadres will have some problems along these latter lines.

Bringing up several million successors to the proletarian revolution is a tremendous strategic measure; it is a great 100 year plan. We absolutely must grasp this great venture well, and cultivate successors from the top all the way to the bottom. On this question of successors, there is not much resistance in the local areas, but considerable resistance in the military, and so I have recommended that several men in their thirties be put in command of the military regions.

As for the GPCR, was it really fine or was it really terrible? This has been a dispute of long standing. It was a recurring theme when the GPCR was underway. P'eng Chen's February outline and Liu Shao-ch'i's bourgeois reactionary line were intended to strangle the cultural revolution. In essence, Lin Piao pursued the same brand of revisionist line as Liu Shao-ch'i. Prior to the 9th Party Congress, he and Chen Po-ta hatched a political report stressing productivity which asserted that the main task after the congress would be to develop production. It was a futile attempt to lend legality to an attack on the GPCR. Mao vetoed this political report. Mao personally supported and stipulated the line of the 9th Congress, maintaining that the revolution would continue under the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the 9th Congress, under the leadership of Mao's revolutionary line, the great victory of smashing Lin Piao's anti-party clique was achieved and the movement of struggle-criticism-transformation deepened. But this did not put to rest the dispute on whether the GPCR was fine or terrible. Since the Second Plenary Session [of the 9th Central Committee], rightist trends have made their appearances both openly and secretly. People like Lung Shu-chin in Sinkiang, Liang and Chen in Szechwan, and the cadres in Honan were of this type. They tried to turn the criticism of Lin Piao and Confucius away from its general orientation in an attempt to counterattack and overturn the GPCR. Their actions were actually part of the struggle between the two classes and between the two lines, and a continuation of that struggle. There will be further struggles of this kind in the future. Mao recently said: "We need another 10 years on the question of the GPCR." This is a reminder that we must be mentally prepared for a protracted struggle. Recently, comrades seeing articles criticizing Lin and Confucius have said: "Ch'in Shih Huang made a revolution that replaced one exploitative system with another, and for that, he was the butt of denunciation for 2,000 years. Will our GPCR fare any better?" It is certain that some people will denounce the GPCR. We must brace ourselves for the certainty that 10 years from now, or decades from now, there will still be people who will

course us and will try to reverse our verdict on Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Biao. Confucius died several thousand years ago, and there are still people who revere him; Ch'in Shih Huang had his revolution at that same time, and as a result, has been cursed by people for 2,000 years.

To oppose the GPCR is to oppose the 9th and the 10th party congresses. This is not a trifling matter. It is a matter of restoring capitalism, it is a matter of revisionism. In my opinion, in order to oppose the cultural revolution, one must set up a capitalist dictatorship. Comrades, let there be no illusions that the capitalist roaders are gone, that the words "capitalist roader" cannot even be mentioned. When revision of the constitution and the party charter was discussed in some localities, there were objections to mentioning capitalist roaders in the texts. What nonsense! As long as class struggle exists, the bourgeoisie will look for agents in the party and thus there will be capitalist roaders. If there were no capitalist roaders, all the movements in the past would have been in vain. The "three anti" and the "five anti" movements, the anti-rightist movement in 1957, the anti-right deviationist movement in 1957, and the "four clean-ups" campaign would all have been in vain. This is why it is written into the party charter. This is a big issue, not a trivial matter. In relation to some people who committed errors of going the capitalist road, after getting some aid, they changed their ways. But does this solve the problem? We cannot change to the extent that there are no more capitalist roaders. There were capitalist roaders before, there will be capitalist roaders in the future. A few people still exercise dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the masses today, and have even said there are no good guys among the rebels. Where is the communist party member spirit in such talks? The truth of Marxism, when boiled down to its basics, is contained in one sentence: It is permissible to rebel. Our old forefather Marx led us in rebellion. Some people cursed us for having built a nation on rebellion. The Chinese Communists, under the leadership of Mao, rebelled against the imperialists, the feudalists, and the bureaucratic capitalists, won and took over political power. What is wrong with that? During the cultural revolution we rebelled against the bourgeoisie, against all the exploiting classes and consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat. What is wrong with that? Some former rebels are now denouncing the rebels. They must have had a change of heart and forgotten their past. The fight against the local bad gentry and the dividing of the land, wasn't that rebellion? If fighting Chiang was not rebellion, what was it? Some people have forgotten all of these things. Naturally, the GPCR was something of a mixed kettle of fish, there was quite a lot of confusion, and a few bad guys wormed their way into the ranks of the rebels. What was surprising about this? When we first organized the Red Army, was it that pure? It was not. This is an unavoidable phenomenon. How can they curse the rebels as being all bad? If the rebels were bad guys, aren't they denying themselves? They have forgotten who it was that led our rebellions and who was the forefather of our rebels.

If a communist does not rebel against capitalist roaders, what does he do? If a communist party member speaks against it, it would be like a betrayal of communism. A communist then, will rebel, will rebel against the bourgeoisie and the exploiting classes. Naturally, as far as the majority of people are concerned, this is all an internal question. When a question of understanding is brought up, they study Mao's instructions, review the spirit of the 10th Congress, and are able to reform: however, as far as these comrades are concerned, they will find the root of their misconception in their world outlook and remold their world outlook according to Marxism, Leninism and Mao Thought. They may not be able to remold their world outlook in a few days. The two types of contradictions may change; some may take a turn for the good side, some may take a turn for the bad side. The understanding of some communist party members is easy to remold, or can be completely changed, and the contradictions between us and the enemy become contradictions among the people. Some contradictions among the people can turn into contradictions between us and the enemy.

In the mind of some of our comrades, the cultural revolution is not seen as the necessary outcome of the class struggles since Liberation, but like a bolt out of the blue sky, a morning revolution. There are even some people who have spoken of the cultural revolution as being one huge mistake, as being extremely reactionary. They have even composed a bit of doggerel which goes: "The old cadres return to their positions, the new cadres go to their units; the support left personnel return to their barracks, and the GPCR was one big mistake." Is this an ideological problem or a typical case of idealist historical view? They now look upon the GPCR as a great mistake, and take no interest in anything that is happening at the moment, and they wait. They are waiting for everything to return to normal. Then they will be happy. They do not look upon development as an ascending spiral, rather they see it as running around in closed circles. In the factories they impose the system of supervision, restriction, and suppression; in the schools they emphasize book learning as the primary objective; they do everything by the old rules. What kind of ideology is this? This is a typically vulgar theory of evolution. Marxist dialectics and all other things are unceasingly advancing and developing. But these conservatives, although they say they are all for dialectics, they are in fact against dialectics. At the mention of enterprise management, they suggest restoring the old rules and regulations that the masses have already thrown out. They are enthusiastic about paying hourly wages, wages based on clocked attendance, and cash rewards, etc. They say these things can arouse enthusiasm. The question they have not considered is: What did the revolutions of the past decades depend upon? Was it awards? Was it hourly wages or pay by clocked attendance? It was not. What we relied on was Mao's revolutionary line. We relied on the hundred million revolutionaries of the masses. We relied upon millet plus rifles. If you want to talk about implementing material incentives, the Soviet revisionists have implemented them with a vengeance. They have implemented them to the point that industry is stagnating and they are encountering internal and external setbacks. If these things

were such wonders, then why did the Leningrad workers rebel? Did the GPCR depend upon material incentives? Or did it depend on the consciousness of the masses? Or did it depend on Mao's revolutionary line mobilizing the masses? Naturally, this is not to say that we do not care about the livelihood of the masses. But concern for the livelihood of the masses and material incentives are two entirely different things. In order to heighten the productivity of labor, we should look for methods in the areas of technical improvements and in mechanization. On the basis of the expansion of production, appropriate increases in the standard of living of the masses are necessary, but to implement hourly wages and incentives is not to show concern for the livelihood of the masses. This would be a great slander against the working class. In building all those railroads, did our Railway Corps depend upon hourly wages? These warriors received 8 yuan a month and no incentives. They depended entirely upon Mao's Thought. Not everybody has to wrestle with these problems. Two ministries of the central government once tried this out. They ran experiments in Shanghai and were booted out by the workers. This was an issue that directly concerned the cultural revolution. We have been doing a lot of talking here. It is hoped that you comrades at these sessions will return home and give some thought to these problems and dare to struggle. The very minimum thing to do is to make the Central Committee aware of these situations. The question has been raised in some areas as to whether or not we can reinstitute the systems of regulations in force prior to the GPCR. In the planning work meeting, one of the workers made his answer very explicit: he said: "No." He gave three reasons. He said: "First, we cannot accept the old systems of 'control, restriction and suppression.' Secondly, we are opposed to (?) the mass payment of monthly bonuses. Thirdly, what applied in the past is not correct now. Production has expanded; we cannot bring out the old ways and fit them without modification upon the new situations, just as an adult cannot wear the clothes of a child." This worker understood dialectics very well. What he said was correct. The situation has improved and our guiding ideology must keep pace, and be in keeping with the new situation. We must be resolutely opposed to retrogression. Mao has instructed us saying: "We must go on discovering, inventing, creating and advancing. Ideas of stagnation, pessimism, inertia and complacency are all wrong." We must make the Lin criticism rectification all pervasive, we must carry forward the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, and sum up the criticism of Confucius. In order to criticize the poison of Lin Piao, we have to overthrow the Confucian shop. Confucius was the first thinker in China's history to systematically and comprehensively promote idealism. All conservatives adulate Confucius. Lin Piao is the modern-day Confucius. The criticism of Lin Piao not only can be coordinated with the criticism of Confucius, but it must be so coordinated. We must destroy the Confucian shop in our minds. Confucius lived during the time of China's great social change from the slave society to the feudal society. He fiercely hated changes in the social system. He defended the slave system to the death, and opposed the feudal system. He plotted in vain to stop the advance of the wheel of history. Confucius

had been the prime minister in the state of Lu for only 7 days when he had the revolutionary Hsiao-cheng Mao killed. When his student Jan Yu showed innovative thinking, Confucius instigated the other students to attack him. Mao has said: "Confucius had some very tyrannical traits, and reeked of fascism. He attempted to go against the tide of history. He was in office less than 3 months. Even when out of office, his restorationist ambition was not allayed. He traveled around lobbying for his ideas. Seeing the general fine situation, he decried that 'the rites have been forgotten and the music lost,' thinking that these were the greatest evils. Yesterday the JEN-MIN JEN-PAO reprinted an article by Che Chun. I hope that everyone would take a good look at it, for it is very well written." (See JEN-MIN JEN-PAO, 13 January 1974 article by Che Chun: "Confucius' Doctrine of the Mean Is the Philosophy for Opposing Social Reform.")

Some people have no affection for Marxism, have a lingering yearning for revisionism, and sigh for it; they have no eyes for the new things of the cultural revolution, and are completely enamored of any old thing.

Mao has said: "The ideological and social system of capitalism is seeing the time when 'the sun presses on the western hills, the last breath has been spent, the morning guarantees no evening.' The communist ideological and social system alone is full of youth and vitality, sweeping the world with the momentum of an avalanche and the force of a thunderbolt." Why would a communist party member, who has chosen communism as the goal of his struggles, retain such a longing for the old things? This is a question which we sitting here have got to study seriously.

Our main purpose is to remind our comrades to seriously study the series of important instructions issued by Mao since the cultural revolution, and firmly bear in mind the three basic principles concerning practicing Marxism and not practicing revisionism. Recently Mao said: "Revisionism will appear in China: our comrades must be alert for criticism of politics with no understanding of politics and criticism of the military commission without understanding of either military affairs or of politics." These instructions of Mao are suitable for being studied in government, in the military, in schools, in the north, east, south and west, everywhere. He is telling us to grasp serious matters, and these are indeed worthy of our discussion. If revisionism is to appear in China, it will do so in the superstructure.

Recently Mao instructed and personally requested that we sing the song "Three Main Rules of Discipline, Eight Points for Attention" because he wanted us to remember that only by being in step can we achieve victory. We must have a correct knowledge and understanding of Mao's instructions, so that we can effectively carry through in the spirit of the 10th party congress, unite, and win still greater victories.