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At no time since it was shown all over the country has the film Inside Story of the Ching Court — described as patriotic though in fact a film of national betrayal — yet been criticized and repudiated.

— Chairman Mao Tse-tung: Letter on the Question of Studies of “The Dream of the Red Chamber”

When the new day dawned over the east of the world in October 1949, China, which had been weighs down by calamities, rose to its feet like a giant.

Guided by Mao Tse-tung’s thought, the Chinese people, after countless bitter struggles, finally threw off the three big mountains that had weighed upon them — imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism — and liberated the whole country.

The storm of the great people’s revolution was washing away the filth from the land of China. But the reactionary ruling classes, unreconciled to their doom, continued to undertake frenzied, large-scale counterattacks in every field. The class struggle was very acute. It was especially complicated on the cultural and ideological fronts. The reactionary films, plays, operas, songs, books and journals that flooded the world of culture were important propaganda weapons in the big counterattacks carried out by the reactionary ruling classes against the revolutionary people. One of the most glaring examples was the reactionary film Inside Story of the Ching Court, which in 1950 was still being widely shown in Peking, Shanghai and other cities.

What should be the attitude of the victorious Chinese people in face of such large-scale counterattacks by reactionary culture? Should they carry out a proletarian cultural revolution, or compromise or surrender to the reactionary culture rampant in society? Every revolutionary comrade faced a new choice and test.

This article first appeared in the No. 5, 1957 issue of the magazine Hóngmíng (Red Flag), published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

Around this reactionary film, the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao waged a serious struggle 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 and should be criticized and repudiated.” He also said: “Somebody called it patriotic; I consider it 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-head of the Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee, in that time, and others, as well as the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, clung stubbornly to their bourgeois reactionary stand and openly opposed Chairman Mao’s directive. They asserted that this reactionary film was “patriotic” and refused to criticize and repudiate it.

Comrade Chiang Ching, then a member of a 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 the film Inside Story of the Ching Court be firmly criticized and repudiated. However, Lu Ting-yi, Chou Yang, Hu and others vigorously opposed this proposal and did their best to advertise the “patriotic progressiveness” of this reactionary film. When Comrade Chiang Ching wanted to act according to Chairman Mao’s directive, they threw at her the reactionary talk of their boss behind the scenes, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road,
certain people opposed it, giving various reasons (mainly that it was an article written by unimportant people) and the Party paper is not a pulp magazine. In a second, film review, the article was allowed to be reprinted in the Wenyi Bao. Later, the "Literary Legacy" page of the Guangming Ribao carried an article critical of "The Dream of the Red Chamber." A number of book studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber" were "written," thus signifying 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 Han."* In 1954 he initiated an "anti-feudal" and anti-bourgeois struggle, namely, the criticism of Yu Ping-po's studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber," and the reactionary ideas of Hsu Shih. On October 16 of the same year, Chairman Mao again wrote in the "Literary and Art Section," Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party and other comrades concerned sternly criticizing certain "important people" in the Party who suppressed the bourgeoisie and were 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 "Studies of the Dream of the Red Chamber," Chairman Mao pointed out:

"This is the first serious attack in thirty years and more on the erroneous views of a so-called authoritative writer in the field of the studies of the Dream of the Red Chamber. The authors are not a few, and they write in the Wenyi Bao (Literary Gazette), as if to ask whether it was all right to criticize Yu Ping-po, but they received no reply. Ignored by the Wenyi Bao, they were against the bourgeoisie and are their own alma mater — Shantung University — and get their support. Their article referring A Brief Commentary of the "Dream of the Red Chamber" was carried in the university journal Wenxian (Literature, History and Philosophy). Then the problem came back again to Peking. Some people want to be known in the Renmin Ribao (People's Daily), to arouse discussion and criticism. This was not done because...

The unprecented great proletarian cultural revolution has once again brought up this question.

Debts have to be paid sooner or later. In the present movement, the great proletarian cultural revolution, this reactionary and completely traitorous film, which has remained uncriticized since the liberation and the subject of the most shameless, shamelessness, and malignantly revolutionary struggles, Wu Han (1823-1866) was "willing" to sacrifice himself to provide poor peasant children with an example."

"Studies of the Dream of the Red Chamber" is a book which evaluated this classical novel from the bourgeois ideolistic view and used bourgeois methods of textual research..."
Of the Ching Court was in fact open opposition to Chairman Mao's criticism and repudiation of Acheson's "White Paper." This was an unbridled attack on Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Obviously, the reason why this reactionary film company and reactionary scribbler made such a film on the theme of China's "rightist" and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them? The "patriotism" they praised turns out to be the so-called "patriotism" of the Emperor Kuang Hsu and his ilk who did not hesitate to rely on imperialism to suppress the revolution and consolidate their rule over the people, as is described in the film. After the Chinese people overthrew the reactionary rule of imperialism and feudalism, they still continue to urge the people to learn the "patriotism" of turning traitor in order to restore and consolidate the exploiting classes' rule over the people. Such is their vicious intention!

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. Likewise, we must resolutely oppose the 'patriotism' of the Japanese aggressors and of Hitler."11 Likewise, we must resolutely oppose the so-called "patriotism" of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, eulogized this reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film and called it "patriotic." Doesn't this expose their true features as reactionaries and imperialists? What country do they love? Their love is for a country dominated by the imperialists, a country dominated by the landlords and the bourgeois; but not our great motherland of the proletariat! The "patriotism" they eulogize is nothing but the theory of national betrayal which all the revolutionary people of our country want to stamp out 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 early as the first days after the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression, the then frightened whites were faced with aggression by U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. Despairing of the future of the Chinese revolution, he actively promoted within the Party a line of neutrality or "peace and democracy" in what he described as a "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 was seeking "peace" from U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and impudently wrote articles in newspapers in which he expressed gratitude to U.S. imperialism. He was already begging for "peace" from U.S. imperialism in an attempt to demoralize the fighting will of the people. He even deceived the people by saying that "the main form of the masses is the continuous and untiring battle for the true, glorious and lawful patriach... 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 "is now sharpening his swords, we must sharpen ours too". Yet this person was talking about their "own people" in the hands of the U.S. imperialists. Energetically advertising the theory of national betrayal, he took the enemy for a father and wanted to be a willing slave of U.S. imperialism. He said: "It is a devil's bargain, not to speak of being an enemy" if China, we, too, may act as its condors, red condors? Comrades are condors. They are running dogs of the imperialists. What's all this about "patriotism"? Obviously a pure lie. With such a mean and shameless slave mentality, long ago eager to be condors for the imperialists, these persons found the reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film "Inside Story" that theikes was well suited to their taste. This was because the theory advocated by Chen Feli, the imperialist agent in the film, that imperialism could help China "regenerate the imperialist people" is directly reflected in their traitorous mentality of eagerly wanting to become condors of imperialism!

"Hearts which have a common beat are linked." This is a line of verse the Emperor Kuang Hsu read on the back of a film while looking depressed at a lute. This 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 should have praised a reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film as "patriotic." One must read the "Lestation Street", where foreign legations were located, and the "Arms Bridge", "Stop the Aliens Bridge". Demonstrating in the streets, the Yi Ho Tuan heroes often shouted the slogan "Kill the foreign devils!" in chorus with the people. But how could the people get away from these foreign devils? Their foreign devils were the tools of imperialism. Some foreigners were so frightened that they hid themselves in coffins and hired professional mourners to carry them out of the city.

In June 1960, Yi Ho Tuan revolutionary activities reached a climax. Day and night, in groups of 30, 40 or 50, the Yi Ho Tuan moved about between the outlying districts marched on the city. Scores of groups arrived each day. The guards at the city gates stood at attention to salute them and shouted to the crowds in the same way. Long columns of the revolutionary people in red turbans, redashes, and shoes trimmed in red, armed with swords and spears, marched with immense dignity in grand parades through the Peking streets. By the blacksmiths outside Chihienm worked day and night before their blazing furnaces making swords and spears for the Yi Ho Tuan.

What Should Be One's Attitude 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: rebellion is justified."12 What should be one's attitude towards the revolutionary movement of the Yi Ho Tuan? Should one support it or oppose it? Should one praise it or denounce it? This is a touchstone distinguishing genuine from fake revolutions, revolutions from counter-revolutionaries.

The Yi Ho Tuan movement which shook our vast land was a great anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolutionary mass movement in modern Chinese history. It was launched by the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan. Should one support it or oppose it? Should one praise it or denounce it? In a sentence, "pat " It is a tool of the imperialists. Even so, there were also some conditions of fearlessness. In the famous battle at the railway town of Langfang to halt the enemy's advance on Peking, the Yi Ho Tuan "blockaded" in the train and heavily challenged with spears an allied force of
more than 1,500 men led by British Admiral Seymour. The enemy lost nearly 50 per cent of his strength, and best a panicly retreat to Tientsin. Later Seymour, recalling his fright, remarked that had the “Boxers” been led by a savage foe, the allied force he led would have been completely annihilated. In the battle to defend Tientsin, the Yi Ho Tuan fought the aggressors’ army hand-to-hand. In one engagement at the railroad station, Yi Ho Tuan’s artillery and cavalry were more than 500 men of an opposing Russian aggressor force of 2,000. The imperialists were forced to admit that they had never before seen anything like the way the Chinese fought with modern weapons. Their only worry that day was that they might be cut off by Tientsin which went on fiercely for over a month. In the battle at Yangtsun the U.S. imperialist aggressor army was mercilessly trounced by the Yi Ho Tuan fighters. From that encounter, the “Boxers” were called the vanguards of all Chinese national armies. One of the vanguards mentioned was the Yi Ho Tuan. They yelled: “Those long brass trumpets can make one’s blood curdle…”

Young people formed a most active and lively force in the Yi Ho Tuan movement. They performed immortal deeds in this great revolutionary movement. The Hung Teng Chao and the Yi Ho Tuan 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 their homeland. They were an inspiration to the Chinese people. They were the leaders of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutionary spirit of China’s young women.

“The Hung Teng Chao and the Yi Ho Tuan are like real brothers and sisters in revolt. They are united, as one, and as one they fight the foreign officials.” This dramatic statement expresses the determination of the Hung Teng Chao to fight the imperialists.

Tales of the heroic deeds of the Hung Teng Chao have circulated widely among the masses of the people ever since. One saying was: “Those Hung Teng girls stare death fearlessly in the face when they charge the foreign cavalry. Their only worry is that they may lag behind under the hill of enemy bullets.” Another comment was: “Since the reigns of Tao Kuan and Hsien Feng all the battles at sea and on land in the world have not been equal to the battle of Hung Teng Chao and the Yi Ho Tuan. The Yi Ho Tuan stood in the breach in the face of the foreign aggressors and who continued to fight the imperialists.”

The heroistic struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan is the glorification of the Chinese people and the foundation stones of the great victory of the Chinese people fifty years later. It gave the aggressors a taste of the iron fists of the Chinese people and smashed the imperialists’ pipe dream of “partitioning China.” Von Walderssee, commander of the invading imperialist armies, reported to the German Kaiser: Your Majesty may entertain the idea of “partitioning China.” Yet there is still immense vitality in them. The Chinese have not lost all their bellicosity, which may be seen in the recent “Boxer Movement.” Whether European or American imperialists, militarily or militarily equipped for the job of ruling over this one-quarter of mankind. It was therefore an ill-advised policy to try demarcation.

Real Marxists have always enthusiastically praised revolutionary mass movements of such a heroic scale. In his great works Chairman Mao gives a high appraisal to the Yi Ho Tuan movement and repeatedly extols its heroic deeds. He regards the Yi Ho Tuan as an important stage in the development of China’s bourgeois democratic revolution. Chairman Mao has pointed out that the Yi Ho Tuan war was a just war against the aggressors. 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.” It shows that “we Chinese have the spirit of a fighting people, both in peace and war, the determination to recover our lost territory by our own efforts, and the ability to stand on our own feet in the face of nations of enemies.” Thanks to the Chinese people for our revolutionary war, the house of the feudal emperors, were carried away by the aggressors to Tientsin by camel, and this took many a month. Many relics preserved for centuries in China, including gold and jade, were burned by the imperialists. Von Walderssee also confessed that there were many cases of rape, brutality, wilful murder and senseless arson in the course of plunder. For as the massacre and suppression continued, Von Walderssee by the imperialists’ lackeys, it was even more brutal and callous.

But the reactionary and thoroughly traitorous film Inside Story of the Ching Court, which was produced by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road backing them, expresses deep-rooted class hatred for the anti-imperialist revolutionary mass movement of the Yi Ho Tuan and tries to smear their heroic deeds. This film says the revolutionary action of the Yi Ho Tuan against imperialism as a sort of barbarous turmoil. It tries its utmost to smear the Yi Ho Tuan, maliciously attacking it as a “mad” “mob” who “conducts its activities as though they were ‘ignorant people’ who engaged in ‘witchcraft’.”

These malicious slanders against the Yi Ho Tuan in the film and those who praised it are completely in tune with the views of the imperialists. At that time Dean Acheson, a chief of the imperialists in the United States, in his “White Paper” as “the anti-food disturbances in China” and “the Boxer Rebellion”. The hired poodles of U.S. imperialism in China declared the Yi Ho Tuan as the “Yi Ho Tuan movement as an off-spring of ignorant superstition and mob hysteria,” as “acting senselessly” and as “Boxers” who committed murder and arson.

Was it the Yi Ho Tuan organized by the Chinese people that went to the imperialist countries in Europe and America and to Japan to stage rebellion and to stir up the Chinese people? Did it only oppress and exploit the Chinese people, thus arousing the masses of the Chinese people to resist? Chairman Mao said, no imperialist country is intellectually or militarily equipped for the job of ruling over this one-quarter of mankind. This is a major question of right and wrong which must be debated and cleared up.

The real bandits who massacred people and committed arson were none other than the imperialists and their lackeys. According to the admissions of Alfonso Bonanni, an Italian imperialist invading forces, he said they were “tremendously arrogant” and “tremendous” over by members of the Yi Ho Tuan. The Yi Ho Tuan that committed arson to those who were notorious for their crimes, especially those subservient to imperialism, and forced them to bow to the ground and repent at the altar set up by the Yi Ho Tuan. 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. The film portrays Chao Shun-chao, a high-ranking mandarin of the Ching dynasty, as one who said: “I beg the Empress Dowager to issue an order to organize the Yi Ho Tuan into an Imperialist army.” The film gladly accepts this suggestion. In this way the Yi Ho Tuan are made out to be partisans of the Empress T’au Hsi. This is an utterly vicious slander.

For a short period the rulers of the Ching dynasty adopted the policy of deceiving and softening up the Yi Ho Tuan. This policy temporarily had some effect. But the Yi Ho Tuan were misled into an erroneous view of the rulers of the Ching dynasty. Some detachments of the Yi Ho Tuan put forward the slogan, “Support the Ching dynasty and work for the overthrow of the foreign aggression.” On the one hand, the complexity of the class contradictions at that time and, on the other hand, the fact that people’s understanding of imperialism and its lackeys that time remained at the stage of perceptual knowledge.

Chairman Mao has taught us that man’s knowledge develops from the lower to the higher stage and from perceptual knowledge to rational knowledge. “Similarly with the Chinese people’s knowledge of imperialism. The first stage was one of superficial, partial, and class-conscious anti-imperialist 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’s knowledge of imperialism saw the internal and external contradictions of imperialism and saw the essential truth that imperialism had allied itself with China’s bourgeoisie to oppress and exploit the masses of the Chinese people. This knowledge began about the
time of the May 4th Movement of 1919. Therefore it is absolutely impermissible to slander the Yi Ho Tuan movement as a tool of the feudal rulers just because it failed to see clearly the nature of imperialism and the feudal reaction. We must always affirm and uphold both their anti-imperialist activities, the Yi Ho Tuan never for a moment ceased their activities against the Ching dynasty. Even after the appearance of the slogan “support the Ching dynasty and wipe out the foreigners”, Chu Heng-teng [Red Lantern Chul], leader of the Yi Ho Tuan, worked out a plan for an attack on Feking and persevered in the anti-feudal struggle.

It was solely to meet the needs of imperialism and the feudal reaction that the right-wing movement film "Inside Story of the Ching Court" so unscrupulously slandered and attacked the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan movement. Its slander at attacks against the revolutionary movement of the Yi Ho Tuan movement reflect the bitter hatred of the class enemy for the peasants—the main force of the Chinese revolution—and the bitter hatred of the class enemy for the revolutionary movement led by our Party. The handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority in taking the capitalist road who backing them did their best to lead this reactionary movement which opposes revolution and sings the praise of reaction. They aimed to get help from the "class souls" of bourgeoisie reformers, in order to use the latter's names, robes and slogans to advocate capitalism in China.

The Reform Movement of 1898 which the film glorifies was a reformist movement of the Chinese bourgeoisie. This movement was launched by certain non-Party bourgeoisie reformers, and was not led by the bourgeoisie reformers who were starting to break away from the feudal ruling class. They launched this movement under the threat of a revolutionary storm and the disaster of national subjugation and in order to save the interests of the landlord class and bourgeoisie. This was an attempt to lead China on to the road of capitalism through reform by way of modernization and constitutional reform from above.

Under the historical conditions of the time, the 1898 Reform Movement was, to some extent, a product of the Chinese bourgeoisie who were dissatisfied with the obsolete and feudalized国家 and class and it played a certain enlightening role in the process of ideological emancipation. We have always recognized and evaluated the Reform Movement. However, by such evaluation we mean an objective assessment of historical personages and incidents from the viewpoint of historical materialism. It does not in any way mean to exalt the Reform Movement. It must also be emphasized that the Reform Movement and its representative participants. The representatives of the 1898 Reform Movement were themselves rulers who exploited and oppressed the Chinese people and were willing to be exploited and could never serve the interests of the people's revolution; it was to consolidate their rule and enable them to exploit the people even more effectively that they wanted to reform China, and they did so but only some minor aspects of the old order. The illusion they cherished was simply the transformation by gradual and devious means of the landlord economy into a semi-feudal and semi-capitalist economy (actually a semi-feudal and semi-colonial economy). This was the reason why the people's revolutionary movement and suppress the revolution in ways that were not apparent on the surface. Even at that time, therefore, reformism could never be the way for the Chinese people.

At the end of the 19th century, two roads of social change were already being advanced in China: One was the bourgeois reformist road which meant the attempt to get to capitalism by means of constitutional reform and modernization from above. In the historical conditions of China at that time, this could not be other than a false dead-end and reaction road because China lacked the historical conditions for constitutional reform that existed in western Europe and Japan. China was then being gradually reduced to a semi-feudal and semi-colonial state under imperialist aggression. The other road, the road taken by the representatives of the Chinese bourgeois reformists, placed their hopes for constitutional reform and modernization precisely on imperialism. They cherished the illusion that they could realize their aims of constitutional reform and modernization by going over completely to the side of imperialism and relying on its strength. The result could only be to bring China itself to the brink of the process of reducing China to a semi-feudal, semi-colonial state in which the development of Chinese capitalism would be absolutely out of the question. The other road was also taken by the representatives of the Chinese bourgeoisie, organized around the Taiping movement and rising up and making revolution by armed struggle. Both the Taiping Revolution and the Yi Ho Tuan movement took this road. These revolutions could not achieve the final victory because they lacked consistent leadership. However, they dealt heavy blows at imperialism and feudalism and promoted China's historical advance.

"I raise my sword to laugh at the sky. A most tragic and moving event, the 1898 Reform Move- ment, ended in the blood of Tan Sze-tung, a courageous enlightened thinker. His death announced the premature end of this movement and the bankruptcy of the bourgeois reformist road. This development was reflected in the reactionary film "Inside Story of the Ching Court" still advocated bourgeois reformism, which had long ago gone bankrupt. This film does its utmost to extol and praise this absurd movement, in order to become "rich and strong, there must be constitutional reform and modernization"? Through the mouth of the Emper- or Kung-hu Hua, the film gives high praise to con- stitutional reform and modernization as a "wealthy and exquisite" laundering reform in such words as "the Meiji reform", "the imperial decree on constitutional reform", and "the nation one hundred years ago will become the richest and most powerful state in the world? This is calling madly for a bourgeois republic, for western bourgeois civilization and for the bourgeois reformist road, which will never be permitted by the revolutionary people!

The film lauds to the skies the representatives of bourgeois reformism, the Emperor Kung-hu Hua in particular, as "a great man" who "lives in the brain and suffered much vexation"... "in the inter- ests of the state and the people", and pictures him as saying "as long as the affairs of state are going well, let people have fun!"

Especially vicious is the way that the film, while singing the praise of emperors, kings, ministers and generals and propagating bourgeois reformism, tries by every means to smear the working people and particularly the "mob". Towards the end of the film, the scenarist, through distorted and slanderous images of peasants and village women, extravagantly glorifies the Emperor Kung-hu Hua, praising him as a "people's friend and defender of the people" and making them say "we all think of His Majesty!" The villagers "offer" eggs and cake to the Emperor Kung-hu Hua. On his departure, the film shows "the people" waving flowers and flags and shouting "long live His Majesty! Long live His Majesty!" The film makes the slander that "the masses are most obedient and most easily satisfied". Are the masses of people really such a submissive, obedient and servile lot? 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 mass struggle of our times. The people, the counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, who backs them, have done so much to sing the praise of this reactionary film and support the struggle of kings, ministers and generals, smear the working people and preach bourgeois reformism serves only to expose their true colours of all-out opposition to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought."

The Chinese people won revolution victory through protracted armed struggle under the leadership of Chairman Mao, and on the eve of the founding of the People's Republic of China Chairman Mao himself said: "we have won the cause against the feudal reaction in the past hundred years, criticizing and repudiating the bourgeois reformist road and proclaiming that "The Chinese people are not a sheen and crystal civilization, bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois republic will be all swept away under the banner of the Chinese people". What is especially infuriating is the fact that after all this the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road should describe this reactionary, out-and-out traitor film, which sings the praise of bourgeois reformism and advocates bourgeois reformism, as a "wealthy and exquisite" laundering reform in such words as "the Meiji reform", "the imperial decree on constitutional reform", and "the nation one hundred years ago will become the richest and most powerful state in the world? This is calling madly for a bourgeois republic, for western bourgeois civilization and for the bourgeois reformist road, which will never be permitted by the revolutionary people!

In his article, On the People's Democratic Dicta- torship, Chairman Mao points out: "We must be clear that the Chinese people's struggle against the Ching dynasty and the Ching dynasty'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 modern methods could save China...and that foreign countries could modernize China." The "Japanese had been successful in learning from the West, and the Chinese could...learn from Japan." The imperialist aggression shattered the fond dreams of the Chinese about learning from the West. It was very odd—why were the teachers always being taught by the students? The Chinese learned a good deal from the West, but they could not make it work and were never able to realize their ideals." Revolutionary leaders saw the October Revolution as Marxism-Leninism. "Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese people, after driving out Japanese imperialism, won their hard-won victory..." "Bourgeois democracy has given way to people's democracy under the leadership of the working class and the bourgeoisie..." This has made it possible to achieve socialism and communism through the people's republic, to abolish classes and create a new world of Great Harmony. Kang Yuwei, 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 countries, but there is not such a republic because she is a country suffering under imperialist oppression. The only way is through a people's republic led by the working class.

A handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and reformists, who are authentically bourgeois, advocated that the capitalist road paid no regard to the historical facts or to the warnings given by Chairman Mao. They continued to use the reactionary reactionary film "Inside Story of the Ching Court," to preposterously extoll the foreign courts, the bourgeois democracy, the bourgeois republic of today, and advocate the construction of such a nation.

This is flagrant opposition to Mao Tse-tung's thought and a vain attempt to restore capitalism in China. They put all their efforts into exalting the reactionary film "Inside Story of the Ching Court" precisely because this film, which opposes revolution and anti-revolution, is meant to be the gong and clear the way for a "new" democracy. They are entirely a part of the bourgeoisie. What they did was in effect to use figures from the past to sing the praise of capitalism and the road of bourgeois reformism. To use this film to mislead the masses is to mislead the revolution.

The ultimate purpose was to overthrow the people's regime, undermine our dictatorship of the proletariat, and deliver the hands of the people into the hands of the bourgeoisie. The serious struggle that developed 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 reform and reactionist ideas on the other.

Under the leadership of the great leader Chairman Mao, the Chinese people fought hard, bloody battles, advanced wave upon wave, and finally carried the great socialist revolution to a victorious completion. With the country liberated, where should liberaled China go? Who should be the fruits of victory belong? Which class was entitled to pick the fruits of the victory? It was a question that affected the lives of millions of people. Such major questions were the focus of the struggle waged between various classes in China's society not only at that time; 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 newly-liberated China to take the capitalist road. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road came forward to pick the peaches on behalf of the bourgeoisie.

Since liberation, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road has gone on dreaming night and day of capitalist restoration, obstinately clinging to his bourgeois world outlook, monstrously yapping for a "new daemons" of modern humanism, 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 permanent new-democratic revolution, though the stage of socialist revolution. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, however, harped on a contrary claim, that "the new-democratic order" is "socialism" or "civilian capitalism".

At the same time, he also vigorously advocated the development of capitalism in the rural areas, clamouring for "long-term protection of the rich peasants and the poor peasants", for "the four freedoms" (freedom to practise usury, to hire labour, to buy and sell land and to carry on private enterprises). He advocated vigorous efforts to foster "the type of our country's War of Liberation revolution" and "the capitalist road, and nothing like it" so as to develop the rich-poueenty. He talked such nonsense as: "At present exploitation is a good thing, pain is pleasant, exploitation is pleasurable, exploitation is the "new democratic order", and campaigned for the development of capitalism in China.

Before and after the nationwide showing of the reactionary film "Inside Story of the Ching Court", he campaigned everywhere, making many sinister speeches, issuing many sinister directives, energetically praising the so-called "progressiveness" and "glory" of the capitalist system, and spreading the absurd idea that "exploitation is inevitable and is highly desirable". Marx said: "Capital comes [into the world] dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt." But the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road talked such nonsense as: "In China, there is not too much capitalism, but too little;" "It is necessary to develop capitalist exploitation for 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 "they can never understand the struggle against the capitalist exploitation. If we do not exploit and use the capitalists, we will lose the struggle; the more we exploit the capitalists, the more capital will be available to the people. If you try to exploit, you will benefit both the state and the people; the more you exploit, the greater will be the resources available for the development of capitalism by the capitalists has its merits in history and such merits are immortal." He energetically advocated the idea that "exploitation is legal" saying: "It is legal to make profit, however great it may be. It is also legal to indulge in beautiful clothes, rouge and powder and wining and dining." Talking like a clown, he addressed capitalists: "Messrs. capitalists, I beg you, please 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 do not exploit me, that will be terrible."

When the workers did not accept his sinking reactionary theories, he slandered them as "failing policy" and "China cannot have a bourgeois revolution.

Speaking like an accomplice of the capitalists, he maliciously threatened the workers: if the "capitalists" persist in exploiting the people, the 

Why, when the eve of the outburst of the War of Resistance Against Japan, did you so strenuously preach the philosophy of self-preservation, a capitalism-oriented outlook, a "bourgeois revolution" and a "new social order", and why did you direct some people to make confessions and surrender to the Kuomintang, betray the Communist party, open up "anti-Communist statements" and had to flee to the Kuomintang? Why, when the victory of the war was achieved, did you advance the capitulation line of "a new stage of peace and democracy"?

Why, after the liberation, did you do your utmost to oppose the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, agriculture and handicrafts, did you propagate with all your might the theory that class struggle was dying out, and actively promote class collaboration and the liquidation of class struggle?

Why, during the three difficult years, did you echo the/echo of the reactionaries, and viciously attacking the three red banners [the Party's general line for building socialism, the great leap forward and the people's communes] while adulterating 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, the fixing of output quotas based on the household" and "the liquidation of struggle in our relations with imperialism, the reactionaries and modern revisionism, and reduction of assistance and support to the revolutionary struggle of other peoples"?

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

Why, in the socialist education movement, did you put forward and push through an opportunist line which was "Left" in form but Right in essence to sabotage the socialist education movement?

Why in the course of the great proletarian cultural revolution have you 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 at all a "veteran revolutionary"! You are a sham revolutionary, a counter-revolutionary. You are the Khrushchov sleeping at our side!

During the past 17 years a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists, with the support of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, have been launching a frenzied, all-round attack 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 front of culture, thoroughly smash the frenzied attacks by this handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, 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 relentlessly to pursue the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backs them, to recapture all the citadels they have usurped and to ensure that Mao Tse-tung's thought occupies all positions. Precisely as Comrade Lin Piao said of this great proletarian cultural revolution: "It is a big 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 in all fields the noxious influences of the bourgeois reactionary line represented by the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road; we must vigorously destroy the old ideas of the exploiting classes 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 forward road. 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 it shine for ever in splendour!

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

NOTES


2 Mao Tse-tung, "Speech at the Meeting of People From Various Walks of Life in Yenan Celebrating Stalin's 60th Birthday Anniversary."


