



PATRIOTISM OR NATIONAL BETRAYAL?

— On the Reactionary Film
Inside Story of the Ching Court

Chi Pen-yu

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

Quotation from Chairman Mao Tse-tung

All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstance should they be allowed to spread unchecked.

“Speech at the Chinese Communist Party’s
National Conference on Propaganda Work”

**PATRIOTISM OR
NATIONAL BETRAYAL?**

— On the Reactionary Film *Inside Story of the
Ching Court*

Chi Pen-yu

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1967

The film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which has been described as patriotic but is in fact a film of national betrayal, has not been criticized and repudiated at any time since it was shown all over the country.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung: "Letter on the Question of Studies of 'The Dream of the Red Chamber'"

IN October 1949, a new dawn broke in the east and China which had been weighed down by calamities rose to its feet like a giant.

Guided by Mao Tse-tung's thought, the Chinese people finally toppled the three mountains of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism and liberated the whole country after countless bitter struggles.

The storm of the great people's revolution started to wash away the filth from the land. But the reactionary ruling classes, unreconciled to their fate, continued to mount desperate, large-scale counter-attacks in every field. The class struggle was very acute. It was especially complicated on the cultural and ideological fronts, and the reactionary films, plays, operas, songs, books and journals that flooded the cultural world were important propaganda weapons in the big counter-attacks of the reactionary ruling classes against the revolutionary people. One of the most prominent examples was the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which was still being widely shown in Peking, Shanghai and other cities in 1950.

What should have been the attitude of the victorious Chinese people in face of such large-scale counter-attacks by reactionary culture? Should they have carried out a proletarian cultural revolution, or compromised and surrendered to the reactionary culture flooding society? Every revolutionary comrade faced this new choice and test.

The proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao waged a serious struggle around this reactionary film against a handful of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road. It was the first major struggle on the cultural and ideological fronts in liberated China.

Chairman Mao sternly pointed out: *Inside Story of the Ching Court is a film of national betrayal which should be criticized and repudiated.* On another occasion he said: **Somebody called the film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* patriotic; I consider it a film of national betrayal, national betrayal through and through.** But the counter-revolutionary revisionists Lu Ting-yi and Chou Yang and a certain Hu, an administrative vice-director of the Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee at the time, and others, as well as the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind, clung to their bourgeois reactionary stand and openly opposed Chairman Mao's instructions. They asserted that this reactionary film was patriotic and refused to criticize and repudiate it.

Comrade Chiang Ching, then a member of the Committee for Guiding Film Work under the Ministry of Culture, upheld the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao and at a number of meetings proposed that *Inside Story of the Ching Court* should be firmly criticized and repudiated. However, Lu Ting-yi, Chou Yang, Hu and others strongly opposed this proposal and did their best to advertise its "patriotic progressiveness". When Comrade Chiang Ching wanted to act according to Chairman Mao's instructions, they threw at her the reactionary talk of their boss behind the scenes, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, and

said: "Comrade so-and-so holds that it is a patriotic film." Upholding the truth, Comrade Chiang Ching stood her ground and, categorically refuting their absurd reactionary statements, insisted that the film should be criticized and repudiated. Forced to give way, they perfunctorily appointed a historian with a reactionary ideology to write a short fake criticism which was really aimed at shielding the film. They considered even this article "too violent" and held up publication, thus smothering a major struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie on the cultural and ideological fronts.

In 1951, Chairman Mao personally led the struggle on the cultural and ideological fronts to criticize the reactionary film *The Life of Wu Hsun*.¹ In 1954, he initiated another major nation-wide struggle, namely, the criticism of Yu Ping-po's *Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"*² and of Hu Shih's reactionary ideas. On October 16 of the same year, Chairman Mao wrote a letter to the comrades of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee and other comrades concerned, sternly criticizing certain big shots in the Party who suppressed the attacks of the nascent forces on the bourgeoisie and became its willing captives. In his letter, Chairman Mao again raised the question of the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*. Referring to the articles written by two young men criticizing *Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"*, he pointed out:

**They are the first serious attack in over thirty years
on the erroneous views of a so-called authoritative**

¹*The Life of Wu Hsun* was a counter-revolutionary film which praised the landlord class and its lackeys, advocated slavishness and capitulationism, and slandered the peasants' revolutionary struggles. Wu Hsun (1838-96) was a landlord's toady whom the film turned into a hero willing to sacrifice himself to provide poor peasant children with a chance to study.

²*Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"* is a book which evaluated this classical novel from the bourgeois idealist point of view and formalistic approach and used bourgeois methods of textual research.

writer in the field of study of *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. The authors are two Youth League members. First they wrote to *Wenyi Bao* (*Literary Gazette*) to ask whether it was all right to criticize Yu Ping-po, but were ignored. Having no other alternative, they wrote to their teachers at their alma mater — Shantung University — and got support. Their article refuting “A Brief Comment on *The Dream of the Red Chamber*” was published in the university journal *Wen Shi Zhe* (*Literature, History and Philosophy*). Then the problem came up again in Peking. Some people asked to have this article reprinted in *Renmin Ribao* (*People’s Daily*) in order to arouse discussion and criticism. This was not done because certain persons opposed it for various reasons (the main one being that it was “an article written by nobodies” and that “the Party paper is not a platform for free debate”). As a result a compromise was reached, and the article was allowed to be reprinted in *Wenyi Bao*. Later, the “Literary Legacy” page of *Guangming Ribao* carried another article by the two young men refuting Yu Ping-po’s book, *Studies of “The Dream of the Red Chamber”*. It seems likely that the struggle is about to start against the Hu Shih school of bourgeois idealism which has been poisoning young people in the field of classical literature for more than thirty years. The whole thing has been set going by two “nobodies”, while the “big shots” usually ignore or even obstruct it, and they form a united front with bourgeois writers on the basis of idealism and are willing captives of the bour-

geoisie. It was almost the same when the films *Inside Story of the Ching Court* and *The Life of Wu Hsun* were shown. The film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which has been described as patriotic but is in fact a film of national betrayal, has not been criticized and repudiated at any time since it was shown all over the country. Although *The Life of Wu Hsun* has been criticized, up to now no lessons have been drawn; what is more, we have the strange situation in which Yu Ping-po’s idealism is tolerated and lively critical essays by “nobodies” are obstructed. This deserves our attention.

However, class struggle is independent of man’s will. Even after Chairman Mao raised the question so sharply, the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists headed by Lu Ting-yi and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind continued to cling to the bourgeois reactionary stand and stubbornly opposed Chairman Mao’s instructions. Twelve years have elapsed since 1954, but *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which is a reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film, remains uncriticized.

The unprecedented great proletarian cultural revolution has raised this question once again.

Sooner or later debts have to be paid. In the present great proletarian cultural revolution, this reactionary and perfidious film, which has remained uncriticized since the liberation, must be subjected to thorough criticism and repudiation by the revolutionary masses. The handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists who opposed Chairman Mao’s instructions and the top Party person taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind must also be thoroughly criticized and repudiated by the revolutionary masses. Accounts must be settled with them in full for their crimes of flagrantly and

recklessly opposing Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, the Party and Mao Tse-tung's thought. The revolutionary masses must overthrow this handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists, remove the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road from his position and make him stand aside.

The reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* is a so-called historical film. It deals with the Reform Movement of 1898 and the struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan in the last years of the Ching Dynasty. Openly taking the stand of imperialism, feudalism and the reactionary bourgeoisie, it wantonly distorts historical facts, prettifies imperialism, feudalism and bourgeois reformism and eulogizes the royalists. It slanders the revolutionary mass movement and the heroic struggle of the people against imperialism and feudalism and preaches national and class capitulation.

The film was made by the Yunghua Film Company, a reactionary film studio whose first film was *The Soul of a Nation*, which conjured up the phantom of Wen Tien-hsiang [a Sung Dynasty (960-1279) prime minister] in order to revive the dying Chiang Kai-shek regime. *Inside Story of the Ching Court* was its second production. The scenario writer Yao Ke is a reactionary scribbler who clings to the counter-revolutionary stand. A sometime editor of the reactionary monthly *Tien Hsia*, he opposed the Chinese revolution and actively served Anglo-American imperialism and the comprador-bourgeoisie. Later he sold himself to the Kuomintang and wrote a series of vulgar reactionary plays. He was a minor running-dog of the reactionary ruling classes. On the eve of liberation, he fled to Hongkong. There is nothing strange in an anti-Communist, anti-popular literary man's writing such a reactionary scenario as *Inside Story of the Ching Court*. But what is strange is that the director and certain vice-directors of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, who donned the cloaks of Communists and proletarian revolutionaries, and the top Party person taking the capitalist road

who supported them from behind should so favour this most reactionary and traitorous film, extol it as patriotic, and thus actively serve as spokesmen for imperialism, feudalism and the reactionary bourgeoisie. Doesn't this call for deep thought?

On the question of the attitude to be adopted towards this reactionary and traitorous film, what are the major differences in principle between the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao, on the one hand, and the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind, on the other? To sum up, there are three differences: namely, what one's attitude should be towards imperialist aggression; towards the Yi Ho Tuan revolutionary mass movement;¹ and towards bourgeois reformism.

WHAT SHOULD ONE'S ATTITUDE BE TOWARDS IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION?

The contradiction between imperialism and the Chinese people is the principal contradiction in modern Chinese society. Imperialism is the first and most ferocious enemy of the Chinese people. How to deal with imperialist aggression is a question of prime importance for the revolution.

On this question the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which was praised as patriotic by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from

¹ The Yi Ho Tuan Movement was the anti-imperialist armed struggle which took place in northern China in 1900. The broad masses of peasants, handicraftsmen and other people took part in this movement. Getting in touch with one another through religious and other channels, they organized themselves on the basis of secret societies and waged a heroic struggle against the joint forces of aggression of the eight imperialist powers—Britain, the United States, Germany, tsarist Russia, Japan, France, Italy and Austria. The movement was put down with indescribable savagery after the joint forces of aggression occupied Tientsin and Peking.

behind, is a perfect exhibition of the most shameful and servile attitude, fear and worship of imperialism and devotion to imperialism.

It expresses mortal fear of the imperialist aggression committed by the "eight-power allied expedition" organized by Britain, the United States, Germany, tsarist Russia, Japan, France, Italy and Austria. It assiduously spreads fear of imperialism, crying that "since the Sino-Japanese War of 1894, China has suffered financial losses, her armed forces are poorly equipped and weak. . . . and it is far inferior to the enemy in effectiveness and numbers", and that "it must not initiate hostilities with any foreign country". Hsu Ching-cheng, a Ching minister, is so frightened by the imperialists that he bursts out wailing.

Chairman Mao teaches us that **revolutionary people must not show the slightest timidity before the wild beasts of imperialism.** But in the eyes of the scenarist and those who praised the film, there is no alternative but to surrender abjectly to imperialist aggression — this is naked national capitulation, the philosophy of quislings.

Moreover, the film strives to inculcate devotion to and worship of imperialism; it goes all out to spread illusions about imperialism and openly peddles the theory of national betrayal. Through the mouth of the Emperor Kuang Hsu's concubine Chen Fei, who plays the part of an agent of imperialism in the film, the scenarist openly welcomes the imperialist aggression against China. Chen Fei says: "The foreign powers will certainly not blame Your Majesty"; "I am sure that the foreign powers will not harm Your Majesty, but on the contrary will help Your Majesty restore the throne and regenerate the imperial regime." And Sun Chia-nai, another Ching minister, asserts: "The envoys of the Eastern and Western Powers are all sympathetic towards Your Majesty." A comparison with the counter-revolutionary propaganda of the imperialists who were committing aggression against China clearly shows that the film sings the same tune as theirs.

To deceive its people, tsarist Russia, for example, alleged that it was "not fighting against China", "but merely putting down a riot, suppressing rebels and helping China's legitimate government to restore order". In "The War in China", his first article on China written as early as 1900, Lenin mercilessly refuted these counter-revolutionary arguments put forward by the aggressors.¹

What in fact is the patriotism of *Inside Story of the Ching Court* so extolled by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind? The patriotism they praised is nothing but the "patriotism" of the Emperor Kuang Hsu and his ilk who did not hesitate to rely on imperialism to restore and consolidate their rule over the people, as described in the film. After the Chinese people had overthrown the reactionary rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, these persons continued to urge the people to learn the "patriotism" of turning traitor in order to restore and consolidate the exploiting classes' rule over the people. What a vicious design!

Chairman Mao teaches us:

The specific content of patriotism is determined by historical conditions. There is the "patriotism" of the Japanese aggressors and of Hitler, and there is our patriotism. Communists must resolutely oppose the "patriotism" of the Japanese aggressors and of Hitler.²

Likewise, we must resolutely oppose the "patriotism" (namely, out-and-out national betrayal) advocated by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The War in China", *Collected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960, Vol. IV, pp. 372-77.

² Mao Tse-tung, "The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War", *Selected Works*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 196.

The treacherous argument for welcoming imperialism to help China "regenerate the imperial regime" advanced by the film is of the same stock as the gangster logic of U.S. imperialism. Singing the same tune as the earlier imperialists in their aggression against China, ex-U.S. Secretary of State Acheson in his 1949 White Paper went on at length about U.S. "concern" for China and described aggression as friendship. Chairman Mao had already sternly rebutted such counter-revolutionary gangster logic in "**Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle**", "**'Friendship' or Aggression?**" and other articles. He had pointed out that it is "**the logic of the U.S. mandarins**" to describe aggression as "**friendship**". Yet a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind yielded to imperialist pressure and were mortally afraid of imperialism. They vainly hoped to arrange a compromise with imperialism and get understanding and help from it. They were deeply dissatisfied with Chairman Mao's great call: "**Cast away illusions, prepare for struggle.**" In fact their boosting of this reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* constituted open opposition to Chairman Mao's criticism and repudiation of Acheson's White Paper. It was an unbridled attack on Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Obviously, the reason why this reactionary film company and its scribbler chose the eve of China's liberation to make this film advocating imperialist "help" in "regenerating the imperial regime" was that they wanted to use it for building up reactionary public opinion and for advocating reliance on U.S. imperialism so as to suppress the Chinese people's revolutionary movement; this was the stratagem they were proposing to the moribund Kuomintang reactionaries. Wholeheartedly taking the stand of imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries, the film catered to the needs of U.S. imperialist aggression against China and served U.S. imperialism and its lackeys by trying to prop up the tottering reactionary regime. The handful of counter-revolutionary

revisionists who paid lip-service to opposing imperialism and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind eulogized this reactionary, one-hundred-per-cent quislingite film and called it patriotic. Doesn't this expose their true features as sham anti-imperialists and genuine capitulationists? Which country do they love? They love a country dominated by the imperialists, a country dominated by the landlords and the bourgeoisie, but not our great motherland under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The patriotism they eulogized is nothing but national betrayal which all the revolutionary people of our country want to trample underfoot.

One thing in particular needs to be pointed out. It is by no means accidental that the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road should have praised a reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film as patriotic. As far back as the first days after victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan (1937-45), he was frightened in the face of aggression by U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. Despairing of the future of the Chinese revolution, he actively promoted a line of national and class capitulation within the Party for what he described as the "new stage of peace and democracy". Chairman Mao called on us to **cast away illusions, to give the enemy tit for tat and fight for every inch of land**, whereas this person actively spread illusions about peace with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and went so far as to publish articles in newspapers in which he expressed gratitude for U.S. imperialist "help" to China and begged U.S. imperialism for "peace" in an attempt to benumb the fighting will of the people. He even deceived the people by saying that "the main form of struggle in the Chinese revolution has become peaceful and parliamentary. It is legal mass struggle and parliamentary struggle", "there should be a change in the whole of the Party's work", and "all political issues should be settled peacefully". Chairman Mao said that as **our enemy was sharpening his swords, we must sharpen ours too**. Yet this person wanted the people to hand over the

weapons they held in their hands. Propagating the theory of national betrayal, he took the enemy as his father and wanted to be a servant of U.S. imperialism. He said: "Since the U.S. insists on seeking compradors in China, we, too, may act as its compradors, red compradors!" But compradors are compradors. They are running-dogs of the imperialists. What the devil is this idea of "red compradors"? It is nothing but knavish talk to hoodwink people. With their slavish and long-standing eagerness to become imperialist compradors, this person and his cohorts found the reactionary and perfidious film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* very well suited to their taste. The reason was that the argument advanced by Chen Fei, the imperialist agent in the film, that imperialism could help China to "regenerate the imperial regime" faithfully reflected their treasonable eagerness to become compradors of imperialism!

"Hearts with a common beat are linked." This is a line of verse the Emperor Kuang Hsu reads out in the film while looking dejectedly at a lake. It is an apt description of the fact that the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road shared the feelings of Kuang Hsu, his concubine and their ilk. On the question of volunteering as imperialist agents, the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and this top Party person who supported them from behind echoed the views of the landlords and the bourgeoisie of over sixty years ago. This is the ideological and class root of their praise for the "patriotism" of this reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film.

WHAT SHOULD ONE'S ATTITUDE BE TOWARDS THE YI HO TUAN REVOLUTIONARY MASS MOVEMENT?

Chairman Mao says: "In the final analysis, the innumerable truths of Marxism may be expressed in one sentence: 'Rebel-

lion is justified.'"¹ What should one's attitude be towards the revolutionary movement of all-out rebellion against imperialism and feudalism launched by the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan? Should one support or oppose it? Should one praise or hate it? This is a touchstone distinguishing genuine from fake revolutionaries, revolutionaries from counter-revolutionaries.

Historically the Yi Ho Tuan movement which shook our vast land was a great modern anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolutionary mass movement embodying the creative spirit of the Chinese people. The Yi Ho Tuan carried on revolutionary activities in town and country in most of northern China. They set up more than eight hundred altars in the city of Peking alone, the political centre where the enemy exercised the tightest rule. Youths who had joined the Yi Ho Tuan drilled every day under the palace walls behind Ching Shan.

At the crucial moment when our country was being partitioned amongst the imperialists, the Yi Ho Tuan heroes stepped forward, held high the great revolutionary banner of patriotic struggle against imperialism and waged a courageous struggle against the imperialist robbers and their lackeys. They splashed the street corners with slogans of every description which expressed the resolve of the Chinese people to fight the imperialists:

*Give back our land and rights!
Oceans of fire and mountains of daggers cannot halt us!
What matter if the Emperor bows to the invader?
We shall not rest while any alien survives.*

They held the imperialists in contempt; they strictly banned imported goods. They renamed the "Legation Street" "Block the Aliens Street" and the Yu Ho Bridge "Stop the Aliens Bridge". Demonstrating in the streets, the Yi Ho Tuan heroes

¹ Mao Tse-tung, "Speech at the Meeting of People from All Walks of Life in Yen-an Celebrating Stalin's 60th Birthday".

often shouted the slogan "Kill the foreign devils!" in unison with civilians, making the imperialists tremble. Some imperialists were so frightened that they hid themselves in coffins which they hired professional mourners to carry out of the city.

In June 1900, Yi Ho Tuan revolutionary activities reached their climax. Day and night, Yi Ho Tuan detachments in scores of groups, each comprising 30 to 50 members, marched on the city from nearby counties. The guards at the city gates saluted them and cleared the way for them. These revolutionary people in red turbans, red sashes, and shoes trimmed in red, armed with swords and spears, marched bravely in grand parades through the streets. The blacksmiths outside Chienmen worked through the night before their blazing forges making swords and spears for the Yi Ho Tuan.

Faced with the savage repression of the imperialist aggressor forces, the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan heroically pitted their primitive swords and spears against the invaders' modern rifles and guns. They demonstrated the Chinese people's militant, revolutionary fearlessness. In the famous battle at the railway town of Langfang to halt the enemy's advance on Peking, the Yi Ho Tuan "pressed on a train and, spear in hand, charged" an allied force of over 1,500 men led by British Admiral Seymour. The enemy lost nearly half his strength and retreated in panic to Tientsin. Recalling his fright, Seymour remarked that, had the "Boxers" been armed with Western weapons, the allied force he led would have been annihilated. In the battle to defend Tientsin, the Yi Ho Tuan fought the aggressors' army hand-to-hand. In a single engagement at the railway station, they killed or wounded more than 500 men out of a Russian aggressor force of 2,000. The imperialists were forced to admit that they had never before seen such desperate fighting as that of the Chinese against the Western soldiers in the bitter month-long battle of Tientsin. In the battle at Yangtsun, the U.S. imperialist aggressor army was mercilessly trounced by the Yi Ho Tuan

fighters. The imperialist aggressor armies trembled at the very bugle call of the Yi Ho Tuan. They wailed: "Those long brass trumpets make one's blood curdle. . . ."

Young people were most active in the great revolutionary Yi Ho Tuan movement, in which they performed immortal deeds. The Hung Teng Chao (Red Lanterns) which amazed China and the world was an organization of young women from many places in northern China. They formed themselves into a well-disciplined force, did military exercises and defended the homeland. They were dressed in red, wore red caps, and carried red lanterns and red-tasselled spears. They fought at the front and ferreted out spies in the rear. Taking an active part in the Yi Ho Tuan uprising and resolutely opposing imperialism and its lackeys, they displayed the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolutionary heroism of China's young women.

*The Hung Teng Chao and the Yi Ho Tuan
Are brothers and sisters in revolt.
With one heart they fight the foreign officials.*

This ditty expressed the determination of the Hung Teng Chao to fight the imperialists.

Tales of the heroic deeds of the Hung Teng Chao have circulated far and wide among the masses ever since. One comment ran: "Those Hung Teng girls look death fearlessly in the face when they charge the enemy positions. Their only worry is that they may lag behind under the hail of bullets." Another comment was: "Since the reigns of Tao Kuang and Hsien Feng all battles by sea and land in coastal China against the alien invaders have ended in defeat . . . but now these girls are giving the foreigners such a trouncing that their victories have struck terror into foreign hearts and heightened the morale of the Chinese people."

The heroic struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan is the pride and glory of the Chinese people and one of the foundation stones for their triumph fifty years later. It gave the aggressors a taste

of the Chinese people's iron fists and smashed the imperialists' pipe dream of partitioning China. Alfred von Walderssee, the commander of the invading imperialist army, reported to German Kaiser Wilhelm, II: "Your Majesty may entertain the idea of partitioning China, but let it not be forgotten that . . . it is still full of inexhaustible vitality. China has not completely lost its martial spirit, as may now be seen in the 'Boxer Movement'." "Neither Japan nor any country in Europe or America," he added, "is intellectually or militarily equipped to rule one quarter of mankind. Therefore it is actually an ill-advised policy to try dismemberment."

True Marxists have always enthusiastically praised such tremendous revolutionary mass movements. In his great works, Chairman Mao highly appraises the Yi Ho Tuan movement and repeatedly extols its heroic deeds. He regards it as an important stage in the development of China's bourgeois democratic revolution. He has pointed out that the Yi Ho Tuan war was a just war against the oppressors. Like other revolutionary wars of the Chinese people in the last hundred years, it **"testifies to the Chinese people's indomitable spirit in fighting imperialism and its lackeys"**.¹ It shows that **"we Chinese have the spirit to fight the enemy to the last drop of our blood, the determination to recover our lost territory by our own efforts, and the ability to stand on our own feet in the family of nations"**.² **"Thanks to the Chinese people's unrelenting and heroic struggle during the last hundred years, imperialism has not been able to subjugate China, nor will it ever be able to do so."**³

But the reactionary and thoroughly traitorous film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which was praised by a handful

¹ Mao Tse-tung, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 314.

² Mao Tse-tung, "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. I, p. 170.

³ Mao Tse-tung, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 314.

of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind, expresses a deep-seated class hatred for the anti-imperialist revolutionary mass movement of the Yi Ho Tuan and does its best to defame and slander it. The film portrays the anti-imperialist revolutionary action of the Yi Ho Tuan as a sort of barbarous disturbance. It tries its utmost to smear the Yi Ho Tuan, maliciously attacking them as a mad mob which "committed murder and arson", and as ignorant people who engaged in "witchcraft".

These slanders hurled by the film against the Yi Ho Tuan and by those who praised it are completely in tune with those of the imperialists. At that time Dean Acheson, a U.S. imperialist chieftain, cursed the Yi Ho Tuan movement in his White Paper as "the anti-foreign disturbances in China" and as "the Boxer Rebellion". The hired pundits of U.S. imperialism in China were also unbridled in their attacks on the Yi Ho Tuan as the "offspring of ignorance, superstition and mob hysteria", as "perpetrators of senseless acts" and as "Boxers" who committed murder and arson.

Was it the Yi Ho Tuan organized by the Chinese people that went to stage rebellion in the imperialist countries of Europe and America and in imperialist Japan and "commit murder and arson"? Or was it the imperialist countries that invaded our country to oppress and exploit the Chinese people, thus arousing the masses of the Chinese people to resist imperialism and its lackeys and corrupt officialdom in China? This is a major question of right and wrong which must be argued out.

The real bandits who massacred people and committed arson were none other than the imperialists themselves together with their lackeys. Von Walderssee, the head of the invading imperialist forces, admitted himself that after occupying Peking, these troops burnt, massacred, plundered, raped, destroyed cultural treasures and committed all manner of crimes. Following their occupation of Peking, the imperialist

troops were granted special permission to loot for three days. This was followed by acts of individual robbery. They plundered everywhere, from the imperial palace and the mansions of the princes to the homes of the common people. "The windows facing the lakeside were opened wide; court officials were alarmed to see a line of camels coming." The historical relics stored in the Summer Palace, a treasure-house of the feudal monarch, were carried away by the aggressors to Tientsin by camel, and this went on for months. Many relics preserved for centuries in China, including the *Yung Lo Encyclopedia*, were stolen or burnt by the imperialists. Von Waldersee also confessed, "Numerous cases of brutality, rape, wilful murder and senseless arson occurred during the looting." The massacre and suppression of the Yi Ho Tuan by the imperialists' lackeys was even more brutal and callous.

With deep indignation Lenin condemned the crimes of massacre and arson committed by the imperialist aggressors. He wrote:

. . . the European governments (the Russian Government among the very first) have already started to partition China. . . . They began to rob China as ghouls rob corpses, and when the seeming corpse attempted to resist, they flung themselves upon it like savage beasts, burning down whole villages, shooting, bayoneting, and drowning in the Amur River unarmed inhabitants, their wives, and their children. And all these Christian exploits are accompanied by howls against the Chinese barbarians who dared to raise their hands against the civilised Europeans.¹

But the film and its eulogists have turned things upside down and given aid and comfort to the evil-doers. They have portrayed the imperialist aggressors who committed robbery, arson, rape and murder as envoys of civilization, while slandering as barbarous rioters the heroic and indomitable Yi Ho

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The War in China", *Collected Works*, FLPH, Moscow, 1960, Vol. IV, p. 374.

Tuan who resolutely resisted imperialist aggression. This is through and through the philosophy of quislings and traitors.

The anti-imperialist patriotic struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan was closely linked with the anti-feudal struggle. Their battle cries were: "Kill the foreigners and wipe out corrupt officials." A ditty of the time runs as follows:

*Kill the foreigners and the mandarin beasts;
There will be no hope for the common people
Until the foreigners and mandarins are gone.*

Here is another:

*First kill the foreign devils
And then beat the corrupt officials.*

Such were their simple anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutionary slogans. They detested the feudal ruling class. When the Yi Ho Tuan controlled Peking in 1900, they put under surveillance most of the offices of the Ching mandarins and the mansions of princes, dukes and aristocrats. They often arrested officials who were notorious for their crimes, and especially those subservient to imperialism, and forced them to kowtow and pay tribute at the altar they set up. Those who had committed the most heinous crimes were put to death.

Yet the film slanders the Yi Ho Tuan as a tool of the feudal rulers. It puts the following words into the mouth of Chao Shu-chiao, a Ching minister: "Your Majesty [the Empress Dowager], I beg you to issue an order to organize the Yi Ho Tuan into a detachment of loyal volunteers." The Empress Dowager gladly accepted this suggestion. In this way the Yi Ho Tuan are made out to be her collaborators. This is a vicious slander.

For a short period the Ching rulers adopted the policy of deceiving and softening up the Yi Ho Tuan. This policy had some temporary effect and some members of the Yi Ho Tuan were led into misunderstanding the Ching rulers. Some detachments of the Yi Ho Tuan put forward the slogan,

“Support the Ching court and wipe out the foreigners”. This reflected, on the one hand, the complexity of the class contradictions and, on the other, the fact that the people’s understanding of imperialism and its lackeys remained at the stage of perceptual knowledge.

Chairman Mao has taught us that man’s knowledge develops from a lower to a higher stage, that is, from perceptual knowledge to rational knowledge.

Similarly with the Chinese people’s knowledge of imperialism. The first stage was one of superficial, perceptual knowledge, as shown in the indiscriminate anti-foreign struggles of the Movement of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, the Yi Ho Tuan Movement, and so on. It was only in the second stage that the Chinese people reached the stage of rational knowledge, saw the internal and external contradictions of imperialism and saw the essential truth that imperialism had allied itself with China’s comprador and feudal classes to oppress and exploit the great masses of the Chinese people. This knowledge began about the time of the May 4th Movement of 1919”¹

Therefore it is absolutely impermissible to slander the Yi Ho Tuan as a tool of the feudal rulers just because they failed to recognize the nature of imperialism and feudalism. As stated above, along with their anti-imperialist activities, the Yi Ho Tuan never for a moment ceased their activities against the Ching court. Even after the appearance of the slogan “Support the Ching court and wipe out the foreigners”, Chu Hung-teng, leader of the Yi Ho Tuan, worked out a plan for an attack on Peking and persevered in the anti-feudal struggle.

It was solely to meet the needs of imperialism and the feudal landlord class that the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* so unscrupulously slandered and attacked the anti-

¹ Mao Tse-tung, “On Practice”, *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. I, p. 301.

imperialist, anti-feudal struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan. Its slanders against the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan reflect the bitter hatred of the class enemy for the peasants — the main force of the Chinese revolution — and for the new-democratic revolutionary movement led by our Party. The handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind were singing the same tune as the imperialists and feudalists when they applauded this reactionary and perfidious film which opposes the Chinese revolution and insults the revolutionary masses. In doing so they were serving as mouthpieces for the counter-revolutionary propaganda of imperialism and feudalism. This has completely exposed their counter-revolutionary class stand, a landlord and bourgeois stand.

The fact that this top Party person so bitterly hates past revolutionary mass movements enables us better to understand why, collaborating as he did with another top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, he put forward a bourgeois reactionary line in the current great proletarian cultural revolution in a vain attempt to extinguish the revolutionary flames lit by Chairman Mao himself, why he confused right and wrong and turned things upside down, organized attacks on the revolutionaries, suppressed the masses and carried out a White Terror, and why he tried in a hundred and one ways to boost the arrogance of the bourgeoisie and crush the morale of the proletariat.

WHAT SHOULD ONE’S ATTITUDE BE TOWARDS BOURGEOIS REFORMISM?

A person’s attitude towards bourgeois reformism is, in fact, a question of his attitude towards the socialist road and the capitalist road.

With regard to this fundamental question concerning the future of the Chinese revolution, differences of principle have long existed between the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao and the Party people in authority taking the capitalist road. These differences of principle became more acute after China was liberated. The question of the attitude to take towards the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* brought these differences to a head. This was the first battle at close quarters on the cultural and ideological fronts in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between the socialist road and the capitalist road. In this battle, the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao in evaluating the film gave the answer to the question of which direction China should take completely different from that of the handful of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road.

A handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind did their best to boost this reactionary film which opposes revolution and sings the praises of reformism. Their aim was to turn to the ghosts of bourgeois reformism for help and use the latter's names, robes and slogans to spread capitalism in China.

The Reform Movement of 1898 glorified by the film was a reformist movement of the Chinese bourgeoisie. It was launched by certain members of the feudal ruling class and a number of bourgeois reformers who were starting to break away from that class. It was launched under the threat of a revolutionary storm and of national ruin, and in the interests of the landlords and the bourgeoisie. This was an attempt to lead China on to the road of capitalism in a reformist way, that is, through constitutional reform and modernization from above.

Under the prevailing conditions, the 1898 Reform Movement was to some extent a blow at the ideological domination of the feudal ruling class, and it played a certain enlightening role

in the process of ideological emancipation. We have always taken note of this point. However, our recognition entails a critical assessment of historical personages and incidents from the viewpoint of historical materialism. In no way does it mean an unprincipled glorifying of the 1898 Reform Movement and its exponents, who were themselves rulers exploiting and oppressing the working people. Their reformist goal never did and never could serve the interests of the people's revolution, but on the contrary this goal was to consolidate their own rule and enable them to exploit the people still more effectively. What they wanted to change was not the essence but only certain minor aspects of the old order. The illusion they cherished was simply the gradual and devious transformation of the landlord economy into a semi-landlord and semi-capitalist economy (actually a semi-feudal and semi-colonial economy). This was an attempt to stem the people's revolutionary movement and imperceptibly suppress the revolution. Therefore, reformism could not be the way out for the Chinese people even then.

At the end of the 19th century, the question of the two roads of social change already existed in China. One road was the bourgeois reformist road through which to try to attain capitalism by means of constitutional reform and modernization from above. In the prevailing conditions this could only be a false and reactionary road, a dead end, because China lacked such historical conditions for reformist modernization as existed in Western Europe and Japan. Under imperialist aggression China was being gradually reduced to a semi-feudal and semi-colonial state. Yet it was precisely on imperialism that Kang Yu-wei and Liang Chi-chao, leaders of the Chinese bourgeois reformists, placed their hopes for constitutional reform and modernization. They cherished the illusion that they could hire themselves out to the side of imperialism and rely on its strength to realize their aims of constitutional reform and modernization. The result could only be to bring the wolf into the house and accelerate the process of reducing China to a

semi-colonial, semi-feudal state so that the development of capitalism in China would be absolutely out of the question. The other road of social change was for the broad masses to rise up and make revolution by armed struggle. This road was the road taken both by the Taiping Revolution and by the Yi Ho Tuan movement. Although it was impossible for these revolutions to achieve final victory in the absence of proletarian leadership, they dealt heavy blows at imperialism and feudalism and gave an impetus to China's historical advance.

"I grasp my sword to laugh at the sky." A most tragic and moving episode in the 1898 Reform Movement was the death of Tan Szu-tung, a courageous and illuminating thinker. His death announced the premature end of this movement and the bankruptcy of the bourgeois reformist road. Half a century later, however, the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* still boosts bourgeois reformism, which was discredited long ago. It tries its utmost to spread the idea that "if China is to become rich and strong, there must be constitutional reform and modernization!" Through the mouth of the Emperor Kuang Hsu, it gives high praise to constitutional reform and modernization, extravagantly lauding reformism in such terms as the "Meiji reform", "the imperial decree on constitutional reform", and "if China begins to reform in this way, it will become the richest and most powerful state in the world in less than thirty years!" All this is a crazy call for a bourgeois republic, for Western bourgeois civilization and for the bourgeois reformist road. This will never be tolerated by the revolutionary people!

The film lauds to the skies the exponents of bourgeois reformism and the Emperor Kuang Hsu in particular. It says that the emperor "wearies his brain and suffers much vexation . . . in the interests of the state and the people", and makes him say, "As long as affairs of state are going well . . . personal health is of little account".

Especially vicious is the way the film tries by every means to smear the working people and vilify the masses as a mob, while singing the praises of emperors, ministers and generals and prettifying bourgeois reformism. Near the end the scenarist glorifies the Emperor Kuang Hsu, by portraying the peasants in a distorted and slanderous way and making them praise him as a "good emperor", "helping us, the people" and say that "our hearts are with His Majesty!" The villagers offer eggs and white rolls to the emperor. On his departure, the film shows "the people kneeling along the roadside to see him off". It gives currency to the slander that "the masses are most obedient and most easily satisfied". Are the masses really such submissive, base and ugly mobs? It is absolutely impermissible to smear the working people! Chairman Mao teaches us: **"The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history."**¹ That the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person taking the capitalist road who supported them from behind have done so much to sing the praises of this reactionary film, which glorifies emperors, ministers and generals, smears the working people and preaches bourgeois reformism, only serves to expose their true colours as all-out opponents of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought.

After the Chinese people had won revolutionary victory through protracted armed struggle under the leadership of Chairman Mao, he summed up the revolutionary struggles of the past century on the eve of the founding of the People's Republic of China. He criticized and repudiated the bourgeois reformist road and proclaimed that **"Western bourgeois civilization, bourgeois democracy and the plan for a bourgeois republic have all gone bankrupt in the eyes of the Chinese people"**.² What especially angers people is the fact that after

¹ *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, FLP, Peking, 1966, p. 118.

² Mao Tse-tung, "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 414.

all this the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road should have described this reactionary and thoroughly traitorous film, which lauds bourgeois reformism and advocates the capitalist road, as a patriotic film and have it shown throughout China without criticism and repudiation. If one can tolerate this, one can tolerate anything!

In his article **“On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship”**, Chairman Mao states: **“From the time of China’s defeat in the Opium War of 1840, Chinese progressives went through untold hardships in their quest for truth from the Western countries.”** Chinese who then sought progress maintained that **“only modernization could save China, only learning from foreign countries could modernize China. . . . The Japanese had been successful in learning from the West, and the Chinese also wished to learn from the Japanese”**. But **“imperialist aggression shattered the fond dreams of the Chinese about learning from the West. It was very odd — why were the teachers always committing aggression against their pupil? The Chinese learned a good deal from the West, but they could not make it work and were never able to realize their ideals”**. **“The salvos of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Leninism. . . . Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese people, after driving out Japanese imperialism, waged the People’s War of Liberation for three years and have basically won victory.”** **“Bourgeois democracy has given way to people’s democracy under the leadership of the working class and the bourgeois republic to the people’s republic. This has made it possible to achieve socialism and communism through the people’s republic, to abolish classes and enter a world of Great Harmony. Kang Yu-wei wrote *Ta Tung Shu*, or the *Book of Great Harmony*, but he did not and could not find the way to achieve Great Harmony. There are bourgeois republics in foreign lands, but China cannot have a bourgeois republic because she is a coun-**

try suffering under imperialist oppression. The only way is through a people’s republic led by the working class.”¹

A handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road disregarded the historical facts as well as the warnings given by Chairman Mao, and continued to use the reactionary and quislingite film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* to prettify Western bourgeois civilization, bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois republic, and advocate bourgeois reformism and the capitalist road. This amounted to flagrantly opposing Mao Tse-tung’s thought and vainly attempting a capitalist restoration in China. They whole-heartedly extolled this reactionary film precisely because by opposing revolution and eulogizing reform, it served to beat the gongs and clear the way for them to stage a capitalist restoration. What they did was in effect to use figures from the past to sing the praises of capitalism and the road of bourgeois reformism, to use this film to mislead the masses and prettify bourgeois reformism. Their ultimate purpose was to overthrow the people’s regime, undermine our dictatorship of the proletariat and transfer the fruits of the victory of the revolution to the bourgeoisie.

The serious struggle which unfolded around the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* was by no means merely a question of one film, but a struggle between the two classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, a struggle between Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung’s thought, on the one hand, and bourgeois reformist and revisionist ideas on the other, a struggle between an attempt at capitalist restoration and the efforts of the proletariat opposing capitalist restoration. In the final analysis, it was a struggle to determine which would win, capitalism or socialism.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 412-14.

Under the leadership of their great leader Chairman Mao, the Chinese people fought hard, bloody battles, advanced wave upon wave, and finally carried the struggle against imperialism and feudalism to victory. The whole country was liberated, but in which direction was liberated China to go? To whom were the fruits of victory to belong? Which class was entitled to pick the peaches from the trees that had been planted and watered by the blood of thousands upon thousands of revolutionary martyrs? These major questions were the focus of the struggle waged between various classes in Chinese society not only then; they remain so even today.

The bourgeoisie wanted to snatch the fruits of victory from out of the hands of the people. They wanted to pick the peaches. They wanted China, which had just been liberated, to take the capitalist road. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road was the very man to pick the peaches on behalf of the bourgeoisie.

Since liberation, this top Party person has gone on dreaming night and day of capitalist restoration, clinging to his bourgeois world outlook, yearning for bourgeois reformism, trying his utmost to stop the Chinese revolution halfway, and giving a big boost to capitalism.

Chairman Mao has said that **the founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949, marked the basic completion of the stage of new-democratic revolution and the beginning of the stage of socialist revolution.** But that top Party person has harped on a contrary tune, actively preaching "consolidation of the new-democratic order" and vociferously appealing for the development of capitalism in China.

Before and after the nation-wide showing of the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, he campaigned everywhere, making many sinister speeches, issuing many sinister directives, praising the "progressiveness" and "glory" of the capitalist system, and spreading the absurd idea that "exploitation is no crime", and that "to rebel is not justified". Marx said: **"Capital comes [into the world] dripping from head to**

foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt."¹ But this top Party person spouted such nonsense as: "In China, there is not too much capitalism, but too little"; "It is necessary to develop capitalist exploitation, because such exploitation is progressive"; "Instead of being an evil, capitalist exploitation today is a contribution." He ranted that "the working people do not oppose exploitation but welcome it", and that "the greater the number of capitalists and the greater the exploitation, the more satisfaction we will have". He also shamelessly told the capitalists that "the agony of the workers is unemployment. What they fear is that no one will exploit them. Therefore, they feel it better to be exploited than not"; "The workers want you to exploit them. If you do not exploit them, they will be miserable"; "The capitalists are also serving the people"; "If you are able to exploit more, you will be benefiting both the state and the people"; "The more you exploit, the greater will be your merit and glory"; "Capitalist exploitation has its historical merits and such merits are immortal". He actively spread the idea that "exploitation is legal", saying, "It is legal to make profits, however large. It is also legal to indulge in beautiful clothes, rouge and powder and wining and dining". Talking like a clown, he addressed the capitalists, "Messrs. capitalists! I beg you to exploit me! If you exploit me, I shall be able to feed myself, and my wife and children will be able to live. If you don't, that will be terrible".

When the workers rejected his foul reactionary theories, he slandered them as "failing to understand politics and having a low level of political consciousness". Speaking like an accomplice of the capitalists, he maliciously threatened the workers, "If the workers are unruly, it is legal [for the capitalists] to struggle against [them]."

At the same time, he energetically advocated the development of capitalist economy in the rural areas, clamouring for "long-term protection of the rich-peasant economy" and

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. I, p. 760.

advancing the "four freedoms" (freedom to practise usury, to hire labour, to buy and sell land and to engage in private enterprise). He advocated vigorous efforts to foster "the type of peasant who owns three horses, a plough and a cart" so as to develop the rich-peasant economy. He talked such rubbish as: "At present exploitation saves people and it is dogmatic to forbid it. Now there must be exploitation and it should be welcomed. If the refugees from south of the Great Wall who go to northeastern China are exploited by the rich peasants there, these refugees will be very grateful for such exploitation"; "Hiring hands is not exploitation; it increases the wealth of society." He also proposed that there should be no limitation on hiring hands to till the land. "It is legal to hire hands to till the land; this benefits the masses too." He claimed that "those who exploit can also be socialists" and that "there is nothing to be afraid of, if there should be ten thousand rich-peasant Party members in northeastern China". All this was aimed at a rapid inundation of the rural areas by the capitalist economy.

In lavishing praise on the man-eating capitalist system of exploitation, neither the hired scholars of the bourgeoisie nor the motley crew of apologists for old and modern revisionism could vie with this top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road.

Each plant yields its own fruit; each class speaks in its own language. This top Party person yearns for capitalism, loves it and talks about it too. The cannibal philosophy he peddles serves solely to develop capitalism and safeguard the sanguinary system of exploitation of man by man. His voice is the voice of the vampire and parasite. This thoroughly exposes his filthy, ugly bourgeois soul.

In trying to justify himself, this top Party person said that his case was one of "a veteran revolutionary meeting new problems".

"A veteran revolutionary meeting new problems" indeed!

Is it possible for a "veteran revolutionary" to work so frantically to restore capitalism?

Is it possible for a "veteran revolutionary" to oppose our great leader Chairman Mao and the great thought of Mao Tse-tung so wildly?

If you really are a "veteran revolutionary", then we would like to ask you:

Why is it that, on the eve of the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against Japan, you so strenuously preached the philosophy of self-preservation, a capitulationist and renegade philosophy, and directed a number of people to make confessions, submit to the Kuomintang and betray the Communist Party, publish anti-Communist statements and vow firmly to oppose communism?

Why is it that, after the victory of the War of Resistance, you advanced the capitulationist line of "a new stage of peace and democracy"?

Why is it that, after liberation, you did your utmost to oppose the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, oppose agricultural co-operation and slash the number of agricultural co-operatives?

Why is it that, after the completion of the transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, agriculture and handicrafts, you forcefully propagated the theory of the dying out of class struggle and advocated class collaboration and the liquidation of class struggle?

Why is it that, during the three difficult years, you echoed the ghosts and monsters at home and abroad in viciously attacking the three red banners [the Party's general line for building socialism, the great leap forward and the people's communes], while preaching the revisionist line of "the extension of private plots and free markets, the increase of small enterprises with sole responsibility for their own profit or loss, and the fixing of output quotas based on the household" and "the liquidation of struggle in our relations with imperial-

ism, the reactionaries and modern revisionism, and the reduction of assistance and support to the revolutionary struggle of other peoples”?

Why is it that in 1962 you republished that poisonous weed, that deceitful book on self-cultivation by Communists, which denies revolution, denies class struggle, denies the seizure of political power and denies the dictatorship of the proletariat, a book which opposes Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, and preaches a decadent bourgeois world outlook and the reactionary philosophy of bourgeois idealism?

Why is it that in the course of the socialist education movement you put forward and pushed through an opportunist line which was “Left” in form but Right in essence to sabotage that movement?

Why is it that in the course of the great proletarian cultural revolution you have colluded with another top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road in putting forward and carrying out the bourgeois reactionary line?

There is only one answer. You are not a “veteran revolutionary” at all! You are a sham revolutionary, a counter-revolutionary. You are a Khrushchov sleeping side by side with us!

During the past seventeen years, a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists, with the support of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, have launched a savage all-round offensive on the proletariat, spreading a great deal of poison in the fields of politics, economy, culture and education. In this great proletarian cultural revolution, we must follow Chairman Mao's teachings, organize a mighty army of the proletarian revolution on the cultural front to smash the unbridled attacks of this handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and this top Party person. We must dig out the root of revisionism in our country, overthrow careerists and conspirators like Khrushchov, prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and the

state, and prevent the restoration of capitalism, so as to guarantee that our country will never change colour!

“With power and to spare we must pursue the tottering foe.” This great proletarian cultural revolution initiated and led by our great leader Chairman Mao himself is aimed precisely at mobilizing the hundreds of millions of people to pursue relentlessly the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who supports them from behind, to recapture all the citadels they have usurped and to ensure that Mao Tse-tung's thought occupies all positions. As Comrade Lin Piao said of this great proletarian cultural revolution: **“It is a major campaign; it is a general attack on the ideas of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes.”** We must respond to the great call of Chairman Mao to hold high the revolutionary banner of criticism, plunge bravely into the battle and thoroughly criticize, repudiate and eliminate the noxious influence exercised in all fields by the bourgeois reactionary line represented by the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road; we must destroy the old ideas of the exploiting classes in a big way and establish the complete ascendancy of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

The road of struggle is tortuous and its development uneven. There is resistance along the road of advance. We must overcome all difficulties, break down all resistance and carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end; we must not give up halfway.

Unfurl the red banner of the great and invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung all over China!

May Mao Tse-tung's thought shine for ever in splendour!

Long live the victory of the great proletarian cultural revolution led personally by our respected and beloved leader Chairman Mao!

— *Hongqi (Red Flag)*, No. 5, 1967

爱国主义还是卖国主义？

评反动影片《清宫秘史》

戚本禹

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1967年第一版

编号：（英）3050—1657

00023

3—E—833P