

Negating the Revolution in Literature And Art Aims at Restoring Capitalism

by the Mass Criticism Group of Peking
and Tsinghua Universities

INITIATED and led personally by our great leader Chairman Mao, the great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is now developing in a deep-going way.

In dishing up the revisionist programme of "taking the three directives as the key link," the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party Teng Hsiao-ping not only made a vindictive attack on the proletariat in the fields of education and science and technology, but also whipped up a Right deviationist wind in literary and art circles. With the spearhead directed at our great leader Chairman Mao, he frenziedly attacked Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line in literature and art, disparaged the model revolutionary theatrical works, slandered the proletariat's leadership over literature and art and tried to reverse the correct verdicts on the revisionist line in literature and art which held sway in the 17 years before the start of the Great Cultural Revolution in 1966. His vain attempt was to achieve the criminal aim of restoring capitalism not only in literary and art arena but in the political arena as well. In order to defend Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, keep to the orientation of carrying on the revolution in literature and art, consolidate and develop the achievements of the revolution in literature and art and exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, we must resolutely beat back the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts.

The Present Is Better Than the Past

The arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party Teng Hsiao-ping slandered that the revolution in literature and art was "in a mess" and said that it was "a question of line." Some even called for a "reappraisal" of the literature and art before the Great Cultural Revolution.

Is the line of the proletarian revolution in literature and art correct or not? Is the present better than the past or is the present not as good as the past on the literary and art front? These are major questions of right and wrong which must be clarified.

Prior to the Great Cultural Revolution, the bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi which controlled the leadership in literary and art circles pushed a counter-revolutionary revisionist line. He and his followers were "enthusiastic about promoting feudal and capitalist art, but not socialist art" and the old Ministry of Culture actually became "the Ministry of Emperors, Kings, Generals and Ministers, the Ministry of Talents

and Beauties or the Ministry of Foreign Mummies." A component part of the superstructure, literature and art in those days did not serve the workers, peasants and soldiers, proletarian politics, socialism and the socialist economic base, but played a disruptive role. Could such literature and art be allowed to spread unchecked without undergoing a revolutionary change? Of course not!

It was only after the proletariat had seized back the leadership in literary and art circles during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that the domination of the revisionist line in literature and art was fundamentally demolished. Thanks to the revolution in literature and art marked by the creation of the model revolutionary theatrical works, China's drama, literature, cinema, music, dance, *chuyi* (balladry, storytelling and cross-talk) and the fine arts underwent a profound transformation, and tremendous changes have taken place in various aspects of literature and art, including the line, orientation, ideas guiding creative work, artistic form and the building of literary and art contingents. Emperors, kings, generals, ministers, talents and beauties have been driven off the stage and the heroic images of workers, peasants and soldiers have taken their places as the leading characters. The reversal of history over the past several thousand years has now been reversed. Our literature and art today reflect the militant course of the Chinese revolution, portray the magnificent scenes in socialist revolution and construction, depict the heat of the struggle and life of the workers, peasants and soldiers, praise the sturdy growth of revolutionary new things and eulogize the great victory of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. Many outstanding works of literature and art, like a sharp dagger, lash at the exploiting classes' ideology, and they are a clarion call inspiring hundreds of millions of people to advance valiantly along the road of continuing the revolution.

The revolution in literature and art in the past ten years or so has gone through twists and turns and has yielded solid fruits. All branches of literature and art have made big advances both qualitatively and quantitatively and large numbers of outstanding works, inspired by the model revolutionary theatrical works, have emerged and have attained high ideological and artistic levels as never before. Many new films of a fairly high ideological and artistic standard have been made. Amateur activities in literary and art creations among workers, peasants and soldiers

have flourished; and in giving theatrical performances, the emphasis is on the grass-roots units. Advancing triumphantly in the direction of serving the workers, peasants and soldiers, proletarian politics and socialism, literature and art have become a powerful instrument for consolidating the socialist economic base and the dictatorship of the proletariat. How can all this be put on a par with the situation in those days before the start of the Great Cultural Revolution when there were poisonous weeds all around and when ghosts and demons danced in riotous revelry, literature and art served only a small number of people and the bourgeoisie exercised dictatorship over the proletariat? The masses have put it well when they said: "In the past, the more performances we saw, the angrier we became; but nowadays, the more we see, the happier we are." Taking the reactionary stand of the bourgeoisie, Teng Hsiao-ping, however, ranted that the question concerning the line to be followed in literature and art had not been solved. This fully shows that what he wanted to follow was a revisionist line directly opposed to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.

It goes without saying that the revolution in literature and art, like all other new things, is still developing and moving forward, and there is still a gap between the literature and art we have at present and the fervent expectations of the workers, peasants and soldiers and the fast developing excellent situation. This requires that we make continued efforts. But there is certainly nothing wrong whatever with the orientation of the revolution in literature and art.

Teng Hsiao-ping resorted to the base means of reversing correct verdicts and trying to stage a comeback under the pretext of opposing "ultra-Leftism." When he saw the feature film *Spring Shoot*, he went away disapprovingly before it ended, slandering it as "ultra-Left." People cannot but ask: Why did he fly into a rage at this film which has won acclaim from the masses? This is because it stung him to the quick, for the film sings the praises of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, successfully creates the typical image of Tien Chun-miao, one of a new generation of young people who have come to the fore during the Great Cultural Revolution, and sharply criticizes those Party persons in power taking the capitalist road. By attacking *Spring Shoot* as "ultra-Left," Teng Hsiao-ping revealed his own ultra-Right stand. In his eyes, not only this film but the revolution in literature and art and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution were "ultra-Left." He never admitted that there was a revisionist line in literature and art before the Great Cultural Revolution and that there were capitalist-roaders in the Party. As he saw it, the Great Cultural Revolution which is a political revolution carried out by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie was utterly wrong and any criticism of the capitalist-roaders was "ultra-Left."

While paying lip service to "never reverse the verdict," he was actually dissatisfied with the Great Cultural Revolution and wanted to settle accounts with it.

The moment he came up with his revisionist programme of "taking the three directives as the key link," he directed some people to engage in underhand activities, going around agitating, fomenting trouble and fabricating rumours. His aim was to negate the entire revolution in literature and art and Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, pull literature and art back to the revisionist line which was predominant before the Great Cultural Revolution, use again literature and art to corrupt the masses and poison their minds, and turn them into a hotbed for creating conditions for capitalist restoration. But reversing correct verdicts and working for a restoration goes against the will of the people, and will turn out to be nothing but a pipe dream!

Literary and Art Creation Must Take Class Struggle as the Key Link

Model revolutionary theatrical works are the fruitful results of practice in line with Chairman Mao's *Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art* and the great achievements of the proletarian revolution in literature and art. The attitude one takes with regard to these works is the focal point in the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines in the field of literature and art. In the course of their improvement and perfection, rich and valuable experiences have been accumulated which are of significance in guiding the creation of our socialist literature and art.

With ulterior motives Teng Hsiao-ping railed against the model revolutionary theatrical works, deriding them as "a single flower blossoming." After Teng Hsiao-ping had called the tune, a handful of persons followed up with a spate of absurdities designed to belittle the experience in creating these theatrical works, negate the guiding role these works play and distort the basic spirit embodied in them. This is a sharp manifestation of the current struggle waged by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat on the literary and art front. The focus of their attack is on the fundamental question of whether literary and art creation should take class struggle as the key link and whether we should do our best to depict typical heroic images of the proletariat.

Is there class struggle in socialist society? Members of the overthrown exploiting classes are still around and are not reconciled to their defeat, the petty bourgeoisie still exists in large numbers, a great number of intellectuals have not remoulded their world outlook, the force of habit and traditional influence inherent in the small producers still exist and the capitalist-roaders in the Party are still on the capitalist road — all this shows that class struggle has not died out. In creating their works, writers and artists must firmly grasp the key link of class struggle and "concentrate such everyday phenomena, typify the contradictions and struggles within them," making big efforts to depict present-day class struggle, especially the struggle waged by the proletariat and revolutionary people against the capitalist-roaders, and describe in a graphic and vivid manner the character, target, task and prospects of the socialist revolution. Those absurdities negating the need of lit-

erature and art to mirror class struggle are a reflection of the theory of the dying out of class struggle in literature and art and a refurbished version under new conditions of the theory of absence of conflict. In fact, they were merely a means used by the bourgeoisie to oppose the proletariat. Those who spread these absurdities wanted to put an end to the struggle by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie; as to their struggle against the proletariat, they certainly did not want to put an end to it, but reminded themselves of this struggle and carried it out with might and main every day.

Should writers and artists create typical heroic images of the proletariat? This is a question of paramount importance concerning which class would take over the stage of literature and art and whether the proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure. The model revolutionary theatrical works, which have successfully portrayed many typical heroic images of the proletariat, warmly eulogize the communist revolutionary spirit and scathingly criticize the reactionary and decadent ideologies such as bourgeois ideas and the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius. This, however, was censured by the revisionists who babbled that if literature and art were all required to create lofty and perfect heroic images of the proletariat, it would lead to "similarity." This is out-and-out mudslinging at revolutionary literature and art. Sure enough, there is really "similarity" between the heroic images of the proletariat and that is the general character they share in common. In the model revolutionary theatrical works, however, the general character of the heroic images is embodied in their individual character and every one of them has his or her own clear-cut characteristics and personality. Is it not a fact that these theatrical works with a history of only a dozen years have already succeeded in depicting a wide range of important subject-matters and creating many vivid heroic images?

It is crystal clear that the model revolutionary theatrical works have helped bring about the blossoming of a hundred flowers in revolutionary literature and art, but why did Teng Hsiao-ping regard this as "a single flower blossoming"? Did he really want to have a hundred flowers blossom in proletarian literature and art? Not at all. Facts in the past and at present have proved that he, representing the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party, always harboured a bitter hatred for the fragrant flowers of socialist literature and art and prostrated himself in admiration before feudal, capitalist and revisionist literature and art. What he tried to do was to smother the fragrant flowers of proletarian literature and art and let feudal, capitalist and revisionist poisonous weeds grow instead, thereby turning literature and art into his tool for restoring capitalism. This is the very essence of the issue.

The Ranks of Literary and Art Workers Must Be Transformed

To push his revisionist programme of "taking the three directives as the key link," Teng Hsiao-ping

vociferously called for "rectification" "in all fields." Flaunting the banner of "rectification," he attempted to "pull" literary and art circles back to the old track, from the formation of leading bodies to the building of literary and art contingents. His aim was to launch a vengeful attack against the proletariat and change Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in literature and art.

While slandering that the new leading bodies in the literary and art circles were incompetent and not even able to run a literary journal well, Teng Hsiao-ping lavished praises on the old Ministry of Culture with a view to reinstating those restorationist "professionals", and letting them again usurp the leadership. If this scheme had succeeded, the bourgeoisie would again exercise dictatorship over the proletariat in the literary and art circles. What a dangerous prospect it would be!

Having been tempered in the Great Cultural Revolution and having had practice in the revolution in literature and art, a contingent of literary and art workers who adhere to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line have been gradually formed and a number of up-and-coming young people from among the workers, peasants and soldiers are maturing on the literary and art front. Gratifying changes have taken place in the mental outlook of literary and art workers after they have assiduously studied works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and Chairman Mao's works, gone to the forefront of the three great revolutionary movements of class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment, and taken the road of integrating themselves with the workers, peasants and soldiers. They learn from the workers, peasants and soldiers, depict them and reproduce their heroic images on the stage, thereby winning acclaim and support from the broad masses. Motivated by their class bias and artistic tastes, the bourgeoisie always tries its utmost to discriminate against things proletarian. They slander the revolutionary literary and art workers as being of a "low level"; what they are concerned about is not the maturing of the younger generation, they are actually trying to crush the revolutionary new forces. Their efforts, however, are merely a pipe dream.

Literature and art used to be the "hereditary domain" of the exploiting classes, where the pernicious influences of feudal, capitalist and revisionist trash were deep-rooted. Under the rule of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and his gang before the Great Cultural Revolution, many people "have acted as high and mighty bureaucrats, have not gone to the workers, peasants and soldiers and have not reflected the socialist revolution and socialist construction." During the Great Cultural Revolution, literary and art workers have made progress, to varying degrees, in remoulding their world outlook. Nevertheless, bourgeois political views, ideas of bourgeois right and bourgeois literary and art thoughts still exist to a serious extent, and there are people who take to the bourgeois style of life. If this state of affairs is not changed, they will not be able to carry out successfully the historical task of the proletarian

(Continued on p. 18.)

(Continued from p. 7.)

revolution in literature and art. Teng Hsiao-ping's opposition to the transformation of the ranks of literary and art workers was, in essence, an attempt on behalf of the bourgeoisie to win over this literary and art contingent from the proletariat and turn it into a social basis for capitalist restoration.

The Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts whipped up by Teng Hsiao-ping in the literary

and art circles was not isolated and accidental; it was a component part of his revisionist line which was opposed to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. The struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind is actually a continuation and deepening of the struggle on the literary and art front between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines and a continuation and deepening of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. We must carry this struggle through to the end.