

SOME
QUESTIONS
CONCERNING
MODERN
REVISIONIST
LITERATURE
IN THE
SOVIET UNION

苏联现代修正主义文学的几个问题

·
外文出版社出版（北京）
1966年第一版
编号：（英）10050—648
00037
10—E—781P

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING
MODERN REVISIONIST LITERATURE
IN THE SOVIET UNION**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1966

CONTENTS

SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING MODERN REVISION- IST LITERATURE IN THE SOVIET UNION	
By Hsiang Hung and Wei Ning	1
Foreword	1
I. Playing Up the Horrors of War and Opposing Rev- olutionary War	3
II. Peddling the Philosophy of Survival and Propagat- ing Capitulationism	9
III. Embellishing the Class Enemy and Advocating the Reactionary Theory of "Human Nature"	15
IV. Extolling the United States and Going All Out for Soviet-U.S. Collaboration	22
Brief Conclusion	27
SELECTED STATEMENTS BY SHOLOKHOV, THE RENE- GADE AUTHOR	
Compiled by Chang Chun	30
THE TRUE FEATURES OF THE RENEGADE SHOLOK- HOV	
By Tsai Hui	56

**SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING MODERN
REVISIONIST LITERATURE IN THE
SOVIET UNION**

By Hsiang Hung and Wei Ning

FOREWORD

Since its usurpation of the leadership of the Soviet Party and government, the Khrushchov revisionist clique has pursued the political line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination in literature and art as in all other spheres, betrayed Lenin's principle of Party spirit in literature, and sold out the interests of the revolutionary people of the world, thus writing a most shameful and decadent page in the history of Soviet literature.

Even worse, this clique tries to impose a revisionist literary line on the people of the world. In defiance of their wishes, it has formulated a revisionist general line consisting in what it calls the development of 20th century literature, asserting that "the general line of development of 20th century literature is to grasp and enrich the tradition of critical realism and socialist realism, that is, the tradition of Maxim Gorky, Andersen Nexö, Romain Rolland, Theodore Dreiser, Thomas Mann and Henrich Mann, Pablo Neruda and Bertolt Brecht, Mikhail Sholokhov, Leon Kruchkowski, Henri Barbusse, Louis Aragon, Vla-

dimir Mayakovsky, Vítězslav Nezval, Mihail Sadoveanu and Johannes Becher".¹

By what they call the general line of development of 20th century literature, the Soviet modern revisionists are actually attempting to prevent the development of genuine socialist and revolutionary literature in the 20th century. They have brazenly excluded the Asian and African writers who stand in the forefront of the anti-U.S. revolutionary struggle. This is a complete exposure of their attitude of hostility and negation towards Asian and African revolutionary literature. Through their "general line of development of 20th century literature", which is a hotchpotch of revolutionary, non-revolutionary and counter-revolutionary writers and which makes no distinction between enemies and friends, they actually want to peddle the wares of Sholokhov's renegade literature under the banner of Gorky's revolutionary literature. They are conducting criminal counter-revolutionary activities under the banner of socialism. While prating about support for the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people of Asia and Africa, they have busied themselves with a meeting to commemorate Kipling, a colonialist writer in an imperialist country.

Because it wears the cloak of "revolution" and "socialism", Soviet literature today is more deceptive than imperialist literature. We must strip off its cloak and analyse its essence to see whom it benefits and whom it harms, and what attitude it adopts towards the liberation struggle of the revolutionary people of the world and the

¹"Art of the Heroic Age", in the Soviet magazine *Communist*, 1964, No. 10.

Asian and African people on the one hand and towards U.S. imperialism, the No. 1 enemy of the people of the world, on the other.

I. PLAYING UP THE HORRORS OF WAR AND OPPOSING REVOLUTIONARY WAR

As Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said, the oppressed nations and peoples of the world have discovered from their common experience and actual struggles that the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries "all have swords in their hands and are out to kill". In the face of the wars of aggression and armed suppression carried out everywhere by imperialism headed by the United States and by its lackeys, they have come to realize that they have no choice but to rise in resistance if they want to win liberation. In particular, the people of Asia and Africa today are more and more firmly grasping the irrefutable truth that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". One after another, they have taken up arms, using that most effective magic weapon, people's revolutionary war, to deal with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

Like U.S. imperialism, the Soviet modern revisionists who have degenerated into its accomplices are scared to death by the surging tide of the armed revolution of the people of the world, and especially of Asia and Africa. In addition to taking "united actions" with U.S. imperialism politically to sabotage the revolutionary struggle of the Asian and African people, they have also used literature and art to spread the fallacy that "even a tiny spark

can cause a world conflagration",¹ and painstakingly to play up the horrors of war and peddle reactionary pacifism in a vain effort to disarm the revolutionary people mentally and to benumb and sap the revolutionary will of the Asian and African people.

Acting on the Soviet leading clique's criminal orders to oppose the people's revolution, many modern revisionist writers make it their primary duty to propagate the theory that "war is destruction" and to spread nuclear horror. Like Khrushchov, they go about clamouring that war means "ruin", "destruction", "fratricide"² and "death", that "blood and ashes" must be the only "synonyms for war",³ that "the earth is full of alarms"⁴ and "mankind is on its last shore"⁵ and that with the existence of nuclear weapons one has only to "press the button, and the world will be destroyed by atomic slaughter".⁶ They have therefore claimed that "war is our common enemy" and shouted, "Down with war!" Take Aitmatov's short novel *The Mother Field* (1963). Through the heroine of *The Mother Field*, the author makes the accusation that because of war "many people have died for nothing" and "many fields have been laid waste". He ends up with the statements: "People beyond the mountains and

¹ N. S. Khrushchov's report to the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., October 1959.

² E. Mezhelaitis's long poem *Man*, 1963.

³ Y. Martsinkyavichius, *Blood and Ashes*, a collection of poems, 1964.

⁴ V. Pavlinov, "The Panic of the Century", the Soviet *Youth* magazine, 1965, No. 11.

⁵ R. Rozhdestvensky, "A Letter to the 30th Century", the Soviet *Youth* magazine, 1963, No. 10.

⁶ A. Klein, "A Second", *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, September 8, 1963.

seas . . . I am the same for all of you" and "my deadliest enemy is he who starts a war!" Take Aseyev's *Harmony* (1963). In this collection there is a poem which is actually entitled "Down with War!" and which reads in part:

*For the whole world
Not to lie in ruin,
Down with
War!
Down with war!
Down with war!*

With equal frenzy the young poet Rozhdestvensky clamoured in his *Requiem* (1961): "We must shatter war. . . . Kill war! Curse war, people of the Earth!"

We hold that there are two major kinds of wars: just, revolutionary wars and unjust, counter-revolutionary wars, and that imperialism headed by the United States is the root cause of all the wars of aggression of our time. We firmly oppose all kinds of unjust wars which obstruct progress, and especially wars of aggression launched by imperialism headed by the United States. As for just wars, and particularly the revolutionary wars of the people of Asia and Africa or anywhere else for national independence and liberation, not only must we refrain from opposing them but we must firmly support and actively participate in them. Revolutionary writers must relentlessly expose and denounce all kinds of unjust wars and must enthusiastically support and praise the just, revolutionary wars of the people. Soviet revisionist writers have done their utmost to blur the distinction of principle between just, revolutionary wars and unjust, counter-revolutionary wars, they indiscriminately and wildly curse all wars and shout "Down with war!" This completely

exposes their renegacy in trying hard to cover up the fact that U.S. imperialism is the arch culprit in launching wars of aggression and in stubbornly opposing people's revolutionary war. We would like to ask: Do you even want to abolish the revolutionary wars waged by the oppressed nations and peoples of the world to overthrow the rule of the aggressors and oppressors? You shout "Down with war!" at a time when the people of southern Vietnam, Laos and other regions are heroically resisting U.S. imperialist aggression by their resolute, protracted revolutionary wars. Isn't it your desire that we, the people of Asia and Africa, should lay down our arms and surrender to U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and allow ourselves to be oppressed and enslaved in perpetuity? Obviously, in cursing and opposing all kinds of wars, you aim at opposing revolution and revolutionary war by the people of Asia and Africa and of other parts of the world for national independence and liberation.

Soviet modern revisionist writers are serving as a special detachment of U.S. imperialism in literature; they are sabotaging the revolutionary struggles of the Asian and African peoples. This renegade stand is especially clear in their treatment of the Anti-Fascist War and of the struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression and for national salvation. Everybody knows that both the Anti-Fascist War waged by the Soviet people between 1941 and 1945 and the present war against U.S. imperialism waged by the Vietnamese people for national salvation are just, revolutionary wars. But the modern revisionist writers flagrantly distort and slander both these wars.

In a series of works on the Anti-Fascist War, the modern revisionist writers of the Soviet Union have de-

liberately portrayed individual happiness as diametrically opposed to that great war against aggression and done their utmost to play up the "cruelty" and "horrors" of that just war, alleging that it brought nothing but "death" and "disaster" to millions upon millions of people.

Let us first look at Sholokhov's story *Fate of a Man* (1956). Before the war Sokolov, the hero of the story, had built a little house of his own and his wife had bought two goats. He said, "What more did we want?" When the war came, "everything was destroyed in a single instant". The Anti-Fascist War ended in victory and the whole world was overwhelmed with joy, but Sokolov, having lost his house and loved ones in the war, had an incurable wound in his heart. His eyes were "filled with such inextinguishable yearning and sadness that it is hard to look into them". At the end of the story the author makes a special point: "Not only in their sleep do they weep, these elderly men whose hair grew grey in the years of war. They weep, too, in their waking hours." This gives still greater stress to the spiritual wound which the great Anti-Fascist War allegedly inflicted upon a whole generation. The author's venomous aim is to spread hatred and fear of revolutionary war by describing a Soviet soldier's tragic fate in the Anti-Fascist War, thereby trying to frighten the people into abandoning their revolutionary struggle against aggressors and oppressors.

To make the point clearer, let us cite two more works. In his novel *July 1941* (1965) G. Baklanov, wishing to play up the "tragedy" of the revolutionary war and smear it as the cause of "disasters" and "death", devotes lavish space to naturalistic description of horrors such as battlefields strewn with the corpses of Red Army soldiers, cities

lying in ruins, houses falling in flames, and panic-stricken women and children crying for help and fleeing for their lives. In V. Bogomolov's story *Zosia* (1965), the hero takes no interest in the recent liberation of two cities by his own troops, but thinks instead that the liberation only means "many sheaves of death-rolls". And so on and so forth. Is not all this clumsy propaganda for the theory that "revolutionary war is destruction"?

Today the Soviet propaganda media have gone so far as actively to portray the revolutionary war of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialist aggression as a war in which "the wounded groaning with pain" and "people in untold misery"¹ are everywhere in evidence. This is a unscrupulous distortion and gross insult to the heroic Vietnamese people. The Soviet government organ *Izvestia* even quoted a foreign reporter as referring to this just war as "one of the major tragedies of the world".² What a wanton calumny against the great anti-U.S. struggle of the heroic Vietnamese people for national salvation!

We do not deny that war brings about destruction, sacrifice and suffering. However, if one fails to oppose imperialist armed aggression and accepts slavery, the ensuing destruction, sacrifice and suffering will be far greater. In a revolutionary war the sacrifice of the few can bring about the security of a whole nation, a whole country, and even the whole of mankind. Temporary suffering can bring about durable or even everlasting peace and happiness. Lenin, the teacher of the world proletarian revolution, said that those who fail to analyse the nature of war and indiscriminately condemn war

¹ TASS, May 4, 1966.

² *Izvestia*, April 17, 1966.

for its inevitable sacrifices and spread reactionary pacifism, are either "abysmally ignorant" or "out-and-out Kolchak-supporting hypocrites [Kolchak was a counter-revolutionary White Guard chieftain—the *authors*]". Are not the modern revisionist writers of the Soviet Union such "out-and-out hypocrites"? They have exaggerated the losses and sacrifices of the few in revolutionary war and placed them in a false light, thus inciting hatred and fear of revolutionary war among the people and instigating opposition to it. By these vicious descriptions they not only directly smear people's revolutionary war, but, in co-ordination with the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. imperialism, they try to corrode, benumb and sap the fighting will of the revolutionary people of the world and sabotage the revolutionary struggle of the Asian and African people. That is why this literature on war themes is straight counter-revolutionary literature and Soviet renegade writers are a literary special detachment serving the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression.

II. PEDDLING THE PHILOSOPHY OF SURVIVAL AND PROPAGATING CAPITULATIONISM

The philosophy of survival represents the interests of the privileged bourgeois stratum of the Soviet Union today. Its members are leading a life totally divorced from the working people, and in ideology they have completely betrayed the tradition of the October Revolution and discarded the great ideal of world revolution. They have set themselves against the people of the Soviet Union and all other countries and married themselves to the imperialists and all the reactionaries.

The modern revisionist writers of the Soviet Union are members of this Soviet privileged stratum and serve as its mouthpieces. They have spared no effort to oppose the people's revolution in all countries in order to preserve the vested interests of this stratum.

Following in the wake of Khrushchov, they have vociferously advocated the idea that survival is everything. For the sake of survival, they have completely written off the heroic deeds of the Soviet people in the Anti-Fascist War, caricatured Soviet soldiers, and painted cowards and traitors who crossed over to the enemy to save their skins in the most glowing colours, as if they were heroes. Sholokhov, Simonov and their like are most conspicuous and energetic in this endeavour.

In *They Fought for the Motherland*, Sholokhov portrays Zvyagintsev, a poltroon who forsook his class stand and forgot hatred for the nation's enemies. Instead of condemning him as a villain, the writer extols him as a "hero". During the German invasion of the Soviet Union, when Zvyagintsev is faced with the danger of his home village being ravaged and his country being overrun by the Germans, he has his mind only on his own survival. He is so frightened by enemy gunfire that he became "tremulous" and "wet with sweat". In despair, he turns to God for help and prays, "Lord save me! Don't let me be wasted, Lord! . . ."

This "hero" portrayed by Sholokhov has not the least flavour of a Red Army man who inveterately hates the fascist aggressors. He is the very image of a mercenary in the service of reaction. We would like to ask: what difference is there between this character and the U.S. imperialist aggressor troops in all their ugliness, contemptibly muttering the Lord's Prayer when badly

mauled by the revolutionary people and retreating in one defeat after another from the battlefields of southern Vietnam as they did earlier in Korea? Through this character, Sholokhov advertises the philosophy that "Death is not an auntie. This villain is equally fearsome to all—the Party member, the non-Party member or any other man. . . ." This philosophy is consistent with the capitulationist idea advocated by the leadership of the CPSU, the idea that "the atomic bomb does not draw class distinctions—it destroys everybody within the range of its destructive action".¹ So if you don't want to die or to come within the range of destructive action of the atomic bomb, the only thing to do is to lay down your arms, fall on your knees and surrender to the imperialists and reactionaries.

Another renegade writer, Simonov, peddles the same revisionist philosophy of survival in his novel *The Living and the Dead* (1960) through the portrayal of a political worker, a former political instructor of the Red Army, Sintsov. One day, when Sintsov temporarily leaves the battlefield on an errand, he feels free for a time from the threat of death. With boundless sympathy, the writer proceeds to describe Sintsov's state of mind:

Now the sun warms, the sky is blue, and the planes are flying somewhere else, not here, and the cannon are not firing at this place, and he walks on, and wants to live so much, so much, that he almost falls prostrate to the ground and weeps and begs greedily for another day, two days, a week of such safe tranquillity in the

¹Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU to All Party Organizations, to All Communists of the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963.

knowledge that so long as it continued, he would not die. . . .

With his own pusillanimous, contemptible philistine mentality, the writer has created and extolled this character who regards personal survival as the greatest "happiness".

Chairman Mao Tse-tung points out that a revolutionary army "has an indomitable spirit and is determined to vanquish all enemies and never to yield. No matter what the difficulties and hardships, so long as a single man remains, he will fight on." This is the true heroism of the revolutionary people. The Soviet modern revisionist writers are afraid of this ideology of the revolutionary people. They attack this ideology, which is being grasped by increasingly vast numbers of revolutionary people, and try to resist it with their philosophy of survival.

Proceeding from the preaching of the philosophy of survival and serving the needs of revisionist politics, the Soviet modern revisionist writers do not limit themselves to the glorification of cowards who are terrified of death; they inevitably take the next step — to prettify traitors who defect to the enemy. Again, let us take Sholokhov's *Fate of a Man*. When Sokolov, its hero, finds that the front line has moved beyond him, he is frightened out of his wits and voluntarily "walks towards the west, towards capture". Later he responds to the call of the Hitler gangsters and works subserviently as a driver for a fascist major, thus openly betraying his motherland. Sokolov, a character lauded to the skies by the Soviet modern revisionists, is in fact an out-and-out traitor.

Soviet literature is now being increasingly thronged with such "heroes". The characters created by V. Bykov are among the most glaring. In his *Pages from the Front*, *The Trap*, *Alpine Ballad* and other works, Bykov exerts himself to play up the vacillation, hesitation, fear of death, etc. of Soviet soldiers in the face of the enemy and eulogizes these cowards as "heroes". In the short novel, *The Trap*, Artillery Lieutenant Klimchenko is captured and later released by the enemy. When he senses that he is not to be shot, he jumps for joy and shouts: "To live! To live! To live!"

Not only does Soviet revisionist literature glorify traitors and defame true heroes, it also peddles the philosophy of survival in the name of writing in memory of martyrs. The long poem *Requiem* by the young poet R. Rozhdestvensky, which we have already mentioned, is a case in point. Under the dedication "To the memory of our fathers and elder brothers, the eternally young men and officers of the Soviet Army who fell on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War", the poem peddles the reactionary idea of refusal to devote one's life to the revolution. The long poem starts histrionically by repeating the line "Eternal glory to the heroes". But immediately afterwards, the poet asks insidiously:

*But what's it for,
This glory
To the dead?
What's it for,
This glory
To the fallen?
Who saved
All that lives.*

*But did not save
Themselves. . . .
What's it for,
This glory
To the dead? . . .*

“What’s it for, this glory to the dead?” What a venomous question! Was personal glory the sole aim of the heroes who valiantly resisted U.S. imperialism and reaction for the liberation and national independence of their countries, and who advanced wave upon wave, shed their blood and laid down their lives? Nguyen Van Troi and a host of unknown heroes of Asia and Africa laid down their lives gloriously in the heat of battle and thus roused more and more fighters of the Nguyen Van Troi type to action. Can it be said that they died in vain?

Soviet modern revisionist writers completely expose their own ugly features by their attitude towards true revolutionary heroes and towards pseudo-revolutionary heroes. In fact, their works preach that for the sake of survival and saving one’s own skin, it does not matter if one becomes a traitor, stooge or lackey, or commits such foul deeds as betraying the national interest, selling out the revolutionary cause and capitulating to imperialism.

The press controlled by the leading group of the CPSU heaps endless praise on such works. They have been translated into foreign languages and adapted into films, which have been forced on Asian, African and other countries to poison the minds of readers and audiences there. The aim in all this is to use the artistic appeal of literature to sap the fighting will of the revolutionary people. From their own experience in the great struggle

against U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries, the people of fighting Asia and Africa have become increasingly aware of the dangers created by contemporary Soviet literature and art; they feel more and more strongly that in order to oppose U.S. imperialism, it is imperative resolutely to oppose modern revisionism. The people in many regions of Asia and Africa firmly boycott literary and art works which advocate the philosophy of survival and peddle capitulationism. This most convincingly shows up the essence of such literature.

III. EMBELLISHING THE CLASS ENEMY AND ADVOCATING THE REACTIONARY THEORY OF “HUMAN NATURE”

In their effort to enforce the capitulationist line of “peaceful coexistence”, the Soviet modern revisionists try hard to embellish the class enemy. For this purpose, they have dug up the reactionary theory of “human nature” to serve as a theoretical basis. They proclaim that human nature is common to the oppressors and the oppressed, to the imperialists and to the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They spread such reactionary viewpoints as the “resurrection of human nature” and the “all-round and harmonious development of man”.

In the chapter “Ballad About a Road” in his long novel *Lipyagi*, S. Krutilin eulogizes the counter-revolutionary kulak Matvei who becomes a “kindly” man because his “human nature has been resurrected”. Matvei is the murderer of the poor peasant Taras. Once a renegade and member of the Makhno bandit gang, Matvei is responsible for the death of many people. But a few years

later, this counter-revolutionary, guilty of the most heinous crimes, is finally overcome by his conscience. He returns to his home village, and kneeling at the feet of Taras's widow, asks her forgiveness. However, he cannot gain understanding and confidence from the people around him. They look upon him with a "scornful eye". Penitent and tormented spiritually, he faces a dead end and finally hangs himself.

The writer spreads the idea that once their "human nature" is resurrected, the counter-revolutionaries will lay down their butcher's knife and kneel at the feet of the people. If this were so, would there be any more need for struggle between the oppressors and the oppressed, between the slave-owners and slaves, and between the butchers of the people and revolutionaries? Would there be any more need for the people to make revolution? One need only wait for the resurrection of "human nature", when all contradictions will be resolved and peace will prevail in the world. But who has ever seen such things happen? Who has ever seen class antagonisms resolved by abstract human nature? The works which laud the power of abstract human nature are sheer embellishment of the enemy and are nothing but swindles and lies.

Sholokhov, in his *And Quiet Flows the Don*, goes much farther than Krutinin's embellishment of Matvei in his glorification of the "human nature" of Grigori, divisional commander in the counter-revolutionary rebel army fighting against the Red Army. Under Sholokhov's pen, Grigori appears from start to finish as kind-hearted, brave, upright and sympathetic. He never loses his "human nature" even when he is rabidly slaughtering Red sailors. He regrets having killed, torments himself,

feels pain and weeps bitterly. And so, this counter-revolutionary officer, sword in hand, is given a noble character! According to Sholokhov's logic, a revolutionary and a counter-revolutionary do not differ by virtue of the class to which they belong. "Human nature" is the sole criterion in judging a person. Grigori is not morally base because he is a divisional commander in a counter-revolutionary rebel army, neither does a revolutionary have a noble spirit because he fights for the revolutionary cause. All men and classes must meet the test of "human nature". In the words of the modern revisionist critics of the Soviet Union,

. . . concerning the shifts that have taken place in the conception of man in Soviet literature: traits which might have seemed positive yesterday now occasionally present themselves as negative. . . . Some recent positive heroes have not passed the examination in human nature. . . . The measuring-stick for human qualities is changing.¹

Beauty has become ugliness and ugliness beauty; enemies have become friends and friends enemies. Such is the great contribution of current Soviet literature in its advocacy of abstract human nature!

They claim that the power of the literature of "human nature" has "blazed" a trail linking the hearts of people belonging to antagonistic classes. In V. Bykov's *The Third Flare*, Red Army man Loznyak comes across a German fascist tankman who is dying from burns. Searching his body, Loznyak discovers "some photographs

¹"Humanism and Modern Literature", published in *Questions on Literature*, No. 11, 1962.

wrapped in cellophane", one of which shows "a smiling girl with blonde hair. . . . Very nice," and another shows the fascist with his mother. On the back of it are inscribed some words in German. While reading the inscription of this fascist bandit who was out to enslave his motherland, the proletarian Red Army man murmurs to himself:

And for a minute these few words leave me at a loss. It's so obvious really, but I never thought my enemy would suddenly turn out to have a mother, a sad-faced elderly woman, or that she would so unexpectedly rise between us. She loves him, he is her last son, and, like any mother, she is fearful that something may happen to him—the very thing that has happened to him. Yes, she gave birth to him, suckled him, rejoiced when he began to walk, began to talk. She saw to it that he didn't get bad marks at school and didn't catch cold, didn't fall ill or get run over. She did just what my mother, Lusya's, Popov's, Lukyanov's and all the millions of other mothers on earth do. He may be a good son, he may love her and be very fond of this girl.

Thinking of all this, Loznyak loses all hatred and courage and feels "tired". What is the author's class stand and for what kind of people is the portrayal of the character intended?

Bykov tells his readers that the nice girl and the aging mother have blotted out the hatred between men from two antagonistic classes, and that the girl's love and the mother's sorrow have linked up their hearts. The gap between the fascists and the people suffering from aggression has narrowed; the two sides have "common"

human nature. Consequently, the enemies and butchers of the people are described as friends. Isn't this a graphic corollary of the much vaunted modern revisionist slogan of the Khrushchovites that "Man is a comrade, friend and brother to man"?

But what "common" human nature is there to speak of between Johnson, who is massacring the people in Vietnam with napalm bombs and toxic chemicals, and the Vietnamese people, who are waging a heroic war of resistance? The two sides are by no means "comrades, friends and brothers". Johnson cannot be regarded as anything other than the sworn enemy of the Vietnamese people.

In actively propagating the idea of the "community of human nature" of all people (whether they are oppressors or the oppressed, the reactionary ruling class or the people), Soviet modern revisionist writers seek to sap and break down the fighting will of the revolutionary people, in a vain attempt permanently to prevent the enslaved, oppressed and exploited people from emancipating themselves.

Soviet modern revisionist literature not only does its utmost to embellish officers and soldiers of counter-revolutionary, aggressor armies, it also sings the same tune as Khrushchov in shamelessly praising U.S. imperialism, the common enemy of people of the world. Take Ehrenburg's *Men, Years, Life* as an example. In his account of a visit to the southern United States, he has to say something about the discrimination and persecution suffered by the Negro people there. However, being mortally afraid of offending U.S. imperialism, he turns round to sing the praises of the U.S. reactionary ruling clique.

I know that now much . . . has changed [referring to persecution of the Negroes by the U.S. ruling clique]. Even American reactionaries have understood that Africa is awakened and that the persecution of Negroes in the United States excludes the possibility of good relations with the newly born states.

.
I have told of my trip to the South not in order to censure the Americans. . . . I am thinking over what I saw and experienced, I want to find a way out.

And the way out is "the harmonious development of man". Under Ehrenburg's pen, the present U.S. ruling class has made "progress" and become "sensible". U.S. imperialism is no longer the enemy No. 1 of the people of the world. The American Negro people can attain their liberation if they will only wait for U.S. imperialism to bestow on them this "harmoniously developed" human nature. According to Ehrenburg, the American Negroes have no need for revolution, nor do the people of Asia, Africa and other parts of the world have any need to struggle against U.S. imperialism.

The fact that Ehrenburg and his ilk have spared no effort in advertising the "progress" of the U.S. ruling class completely exposes the Soviet modern revisionist writers as stooges in their attitude towards U.S. imperialism. Siding with the U.S. reactionaries, they are hoodwinking the people, covering up the heinous crimes of the U.S. imperialists in conducting armed aggression everywhere abroad and enforcing cruel fascist rule at home. Thus they try to induce the oppressed people throughout the world (including the American people) to give up the struggle and abstain from revolution, and in-

stead to wait idly for the U.S. imperialists to make steady "progress", and to beg them to show mercy. Lenin said, "The slave who drools when smugly describing the delights of slavish existence and who goes into ecstasies over his good and kind master is a grovelling boor." Ehrenburg and his ilk are just such grovelling boors.

Soviet modern revisionist writers have thrown the laws of class struggle to the winds and lauded the reactionary, supra-class theory of human nature to an absurd degree. They have made "human nature" the universal key to resolving the contradictions among all classes and among all nations.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said, ". . . there is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In class society there is only human nature of a class character; there is no human nature above classes." In persistently advocating a human nature common to different classes, human nature in the abstract, the revisionist writers are actually making it serve their political capitulationism.

The laws of class struggle are independent of man's will. Where there is aggression, there is resistance, and where there is enslavement, there is revolution. However often the lie about human nature in the abstract is repeated, it remains a lie. The nature of the imperialists and all the reactionaries will never change and they will not go against the law by which they are governed — make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again . . . till their doom. Likewise, the people of Asia and Africa will follow their own law in their revolutionary struggles — fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again . . . till their victory.

IV. EXTOLLING THE UNITED STATES AND GOING ALL OUT FOR SOVIET-U.S. COLLABORATION

We have said that Soviet modern revisionist literature and art are of a thoroughgoing renegade character and that Soviet renegade writers have completely degenerated into a special detachment serving the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression. This finds expression not only in their large numbers of literary and art works which are intended to spread the theory that "revolutionary war is destruction", to advocate the philosophy of survival and the reactionary theory of "human nature" and to peddle capitulationism; it is also expressed in their attitude towards U.S. imperialism and its reactionary literature and art.

Today the revolutionary people of the world have arrived at a clear understanding of the fact that U.S. imperialism is their most ferocious common enemy. That is why the people, particularly the revolutionary people of Asia and Africa, not only unanimously condemn and denounce U.S. imperialism politically, but have risen in armed struggle in many areas to oppose its aggression and armed suppression. Many Asian and African countries have angrily driven out the U.S. imperialist "information centres" and "peace corps", burned in effigy the American president, the ringleader of war, and firmly oppose and boycott the invasion of reactionary imperialist culture. But the Soviet modern revisionists are stepping up their "cultural exchange" with U.S. imperialism to pave the way for the latter's ideological infiltration of the Soviet Union and to bring about "peaceful evolution". To the Soviet revisionists, America's New York is no longer

the "City of the Yellow Devil" (Gorky), and whoever depicts it "only in black paint" is "making a big mistake".¹

In recent years, the Soviet government has concluded annual cultural exchange agreements with the United States covering many items. Under these agreements, all sorts of U.S. delegations, exhibitions, literary works, plays, films and jazz music have made their way into the Soviet Union in a continuous flow. Soviet literary and art circles not only laud them to the skies, they call upon writers and artists to learn from them.

A great many American literary works have been published in the Soviet Union, many of which are reactionary and decadent works which sap the revolutionary will of the people. The magazine *New World* edited by A. Tvardovsky plays an especially bad role in this respect. Among contemporary Soviet writers it has become a fashion to take American literature as a model. They have even praised such a novel as Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye*, which is representative of American beatnik literature and luridly idealizes the decadent, loose life of American youth. They call it "truthful and realistic", and say it bears "the sign of a real masterpiece".² Some young writers even worship such literature as a "first-rate school" and model their own works on it.

At present, among those who model their works on decadent U.S. literature and openly defend it from the standpoint of U.S. imperialism, the younger Soviet writers, the self-styled progeny of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, have gone very far, Aksyonov among the

¹ Y. Zhukov, "In the Land of Swaying Skyscrapers", *Literary Gazette*, November 23, 1965.

² "On Salinger's Novel", in the Soviet magazine *Foreign Literature*, No. 11, 1960.

novelists and Yevtushenko among the poets being the two most conspicuous. V. Aksyonov specializes in describing profligacy and promiscuity among the Soviet youth and in smearing the socialist system. His representative work *The Star-Ticket* is the story of four beatniks, boys and girls, who, after finishing middle school, leave their homes and roam the country together seeking thrills. The author openly propagates the reactionary, morbid outlook on life and idealizes the American decadent way of life. Soviet literary and art circles themselves admit that this novel is very similar to *Catcher in the Rye*. But this evil tendency in literary creation has been acclaimed by many critics and writers who praise Aksyonov for having created the "Russian Salinger style" and call him the best of the younger novelists.

The works of E. Yevtushenko still more eloquently testify to the merger of Soviet and U.S. culture. Because of his preaching of the rotten world outlook of the bourgeoisie and because of his ribald, decadent, sensual poems, the West has given him the title of the "leader of Russia's beatniks". And in close co-ordination with the political needs of the Soviet revisionist clique, he has written many poems fawning upon the U.S.A. and capitulating to it. In 1961, when the revolutionary people of the world were angrily denouncing U.S. imperialism for its monstrous crimes in the Congo, he wrote a poem expressing his desire to share the same destiny as that of the United States, and even demanded that the word Gringo should be "permanently deleted from the dictionary".¹ In 1962 when Kennedy brazenly announced the blockade of Cuba

¹ Yevtushenko, "American Graveyard in Cuba", *Literary Gazette*, September 19, 1961.

and Khrushchov was capitulating wholesale in his attempt to sell out the Cuban people, Yevtushenko hastened to publish his poem slandering Cuba and spreading the idea of surrender to U.S. imperialism. He even had the effrontery to change the Cuban people's revolutionary slogan "Cuba Yes! Yankees No!" into "Cuba Yes! Yankees Yes!"¹

Not only do the modern revisionist writers worship the reactionary literature and art of U.S. imperialism, fulsomely extol them as the rarest treasures and hold them up as examples to follow. They also do everything in their power to prettify and praise the United States politically and feverishly advocate Soviet-U.S. collaboration. Most barefaced and conspicuous in this respect are Sholokhov, Korneichuk and Ehrenburg, who are among the Soviet revisionist clique's biggest and most faithful political brokers in the literary and art field. Through their actions, statements and works, these men play an active part in carrying out the revisionist policies.

In 1959 when Khrushchov went to the United States to make a political deal on U.S.-Soviet collaboration, Sholokhov was one of the most important members of his entourage. Before Sholokhov set out on the trip, to show his intention of capitulating to U.S. imperialism he pleaded with the "Americans": "Let us go and visit each other like this. We have nothing to argue and fight with each other about."² Korneichuk went a step further by writing into his play *On the Dnieper* the Camp David talks between Khrushchov and Eisenhower on U.S.-

¹ Yevtushenko, "Cuba and the United States", *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, October 21, 1962.

² Sholokhov, "We Have Nothing to Fight with Each Other About", *Literary Gazette*, September 17, 1959.

Soviet collaboration for world domination. He included whole passages culled from Khrushchov's press interviews in the United States, adding flattering comments such as: "Terrific diplomacy!", "Our Nikita is met by the Americans with warmth and respect. . . ." Korneichuk shamelessly made a character in the play extol Khrushchov and say that he would "bring back a plane-load of new ideas" from U.S. imperialism. Korneichuk so worships U.S. imperialism that an agricultural worker applying for admission to the Communist Party must be able to state that the "basic task" in the construction of so-called communism is to "overtake the United States quickly and in all indices".

In 1963 when the Soviet revisionist leadership concluded the tripartite treaty on the partial ban of nuclear tests with the United States and Britain, a treaty which betrays the interests of the revolutionary people of the world, the revisionist writers raised yet another hullabaloo to curry favour with the United States, and Sholokhov was again most vocal. He appealed to writers to "reach agreement" and "find a common language" as had been done by the "great statesmen and diplomats" of the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain.¹

The reactionary writer Ehrenburg has never concealed his desire to worship, fawn upon and capitulate to the United States. He says in his *Memoirs*, published in 1965, "The United States occupies an important place in the life of mankind. And without understanding the United States, we cannot understand our era." He boasted that

¹Sholokhov, "Serve the People with Honour", an opening speech at the Leningrad meeting of the European Association of Writers, *Literary Gazette*, August 6, 1963.

as far back as 1950 he had written, "I support peace — I support not only peace with the United States of Robeson and Fast, but peace with the United States of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson. . . ." There is a foreign saying, "Tell me who is your friend, and I can tell what kind of person you are." Ehrenburg, an agent of U.S. imperialism, has made his confession of his own volition.

Today when the revolutionary people of the world are firmly opposing the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression and the oppressed nations and peoples on the five continents are angrily shouting "Down with U.S. imperialism!", "Yankees, Go Home!", the Soviet modern revisionists go all out to achieve a merger of Soviet and U.S. culture, vociferously support the "peace" proclaimed by the No. 1 war criminal, U.S. imperialism, and cry out at the top of their voices, "Yankees Yes!" Isn't this open assistance to U.S. imperialism in opposing the revolutionary struggle of the people of Asia, Africa and the whole world? Isn't this a wild attempt to make the Asian and African people submit permanently to the arrogance of imperialism, allow themselves to be butchered by it and remain its slaves forever?

BRIEF CONCLUSION

From the above analysis, we can clearly see that Soviet literature today is out-and-out renegade literature and has completely degenerated into an accomplice of U.S. imperialism.

The Soviet revisionist leading clique has done its best to pursue the capitulationist line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination. It has gone all out in its

sham opposition but real capitulation to imperialism, sham revolution but real betrayal, sham unity but real split. It has betrayed the revolutionary cause of the people of the world and undermined the liberation struggle of the people of Asia and Africa.

In compliance with the counter-revolutionary will of the Soviet leading clique, the Soviet modern revisionist writers use their works to play up the horrors of war, oppose revolutionary war, peddle the philosophy of survival, propagate capitulationism, embellish class enemies and advertise the reactionary theory of human nature. In addition, they use various devices to lavish adulation on U.S. imperialism and to advocate Soviet-U.S. collaboration. Although ostensibly they still keep the signboard of socialism, they actually engage in counter-revolutionary dealings and function in the literary field as a special detachment serving the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. imperialism. Precisely because Soviet modern revisionist literature still uses socialism as a cloak, it is playing a worse and more wicked role than the U.S. imperialist propaganda machinery in corroding, benumbing and sapping the fighting will of the revolutionary people and in sabotaging the revolutionary cause of the Asian and African people, a role which the U.S. imperialist propaganda machinery cannot itself fulfil.

If we the people of Asia and Africa want to make revolution, oppose imperialism and win liberation, we must oppose Khrushchov modern revisionism; if we Asian and African writers want to make revolution, oppose imperialism and make our literature a powerful weapon in the hands of the Asian and African people for uniting

and educating the people and for attacking and destroying the enemy in the struggle for liberation, we must resolutely and whole-heartedly oppose Soviet modern revisionist literature.

**SELECTED STATEMENTS BY SHOLOKHOV, THE
RENEGADE AUTHOR**

Compiled by Chang Chun

FOREWORD

Sholokhov is the forerunner of revisionist literature in the Soviet Union and an impetuous fugleman clearing the path for the restoration of capitalism on the ideological front. He is a mouthpiece of Khrushchov and his successors in their betrayal of the revolution. Tales of the Don, And Quiet Flows the Don, Virgin Soil Upturned, They Fought for the Motherland, Fate of a Man and his other reactionary works are typical examples of modern revisionist literature and are ideological weapons of imperialism and modern revisionism against socialism and the revolution of the peoples of the world. He extols White Guard officers, defames the revolutionary people, venomously attacks the Soviet path of collectivization and draws a distorted picture of the revolutionary civil war of the Soviet Union and the Great Anti-Fascist War. It was precisely for these reasons that Sholokhov, in his role of a "traitor of the East", obtained the price for the sale of his soul — the Nobel prize for literature bestowed upon him by the Western bourgeoisie last year.

A brief selection from statements by Sholokhov is printed here, with the necessary comments, under four

headings: I. Active peddling of Khrushchov revisionism and shameless betrayal of the proletarian revolution; II. Advocacy of Soviet-U.S. collaboration and capitulation to U.S. imperialism; III. Exaggeration of the horrors of war and opposition to the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world; IV. The renegade's "reward".

**I. ACTIVE PEDDLING OF KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISM
AND SHAMELESS BETRAYAL OF THE
PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION**

Editor's note: Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Khrushchov clique has been going all out to advertise its revisionist programme of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition" and of the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people". Stripped of its disguise, this programme is aimed at opposing the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world, capitulating to U.S. imperialism and serving the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world internationally, and at abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and restoring capitalism internally. Let us see how Sholokhov lauds this reactionary programme which betrays the Soviet people and all the revolutionary people of the world.

The programme [that is, the revisionist programme of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the programme of "peace-

ful coexistence”, “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition” and of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the entire people”] is magnificent and noble indeed. . . .

How can one not say “thank you” from the bottom of one’s heart to those who worked on the creation of this programme, those who embodied the dreams and long-cherished aspirations of the people in a clearly defined task, foreseeing, in Lenin’s way, our near and distant future which we cherish so dearly! And first of all how can one not say such a “thank you” to the chief author of the programme — our Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov! [Comment: Khrushchov had boasted that his programme would give the Soviet people goulash. But with the application of his perverse revisionist programme, the Soviet Union has had to import over ten million tons of wheat almost every year in the last few years. This fact alone makes obvious what sort of stuff this programme consists of, and what sort of a character its chief author is. Yet Sholokhov lavished endless praise on the revisionist soap-bubble “paradise” and on its venerable architect, Khrushchov. Indeed, his ingratiating flattery of Khrushchov knew no bounds. Trying to cross the river, that Buddha of clay has become so much mud. How pitiful of Sholokhov to have worshipped this clay Buddha! However, his tragedy is not confined to the nauseating flattery he lavished on the revisionist boss who has been spurned by the people; what is more pitiful is the fact that after Sholokhov had slapped himself in the face in public, he had the impudence to declare that his works were marked by a realistic, true and profound understanding of life.] Dear Nikita Sergeyevich, I would have liked to say to you a few even warmer

words, but my personal friendship with and deep respect for you, you understand, somehow embarrass me, and become a clear hindrance in the present circumstances. Then, as you know, masculine, friendly love is always a little reticent.

— Speech at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, published in *Pravda*, October 25, 1961

Comment: For us revolutionary people, the “near and distant future which we cherish so dearly” is the elimination of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and all the systems of exploitation of man by man; it is the complete liberation of mankind. For the Khrushchov revisionists, however, it means saving their skins by currying favour with U.S. imperialism at the expense of the interests of the revolutionary people of the world. In the eleven years after his usurpation of the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, Khrushchov, the No. 1 representative of revisionism, did every possible evil and has gone down in history as a renegade. Isn’t it clear enough that Sholokhov, who so disgustingly eulogized this accomplice of U.S. imperialism, is a renegade too?

Every one of us writes in compliance with the orders of his heart, and our hearts belong to our Party and to our people, whom we serve with our art.

— Speech at the Second All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, published in the *Literary Gazette*, December 26, 1954

Comment: Sholokhov has indeed been writing in compliance with “the orders of his heart”. But he lies grossly when he says that his heart belongs to “the people”. Please note: Not long after he said this, he released his

Fate of a Man. Prior to fascist Germany's armed aggression, he vigorously advocated the traitor's philosophy of survival, confused the nature of the war and exaggerated the sufferings undergone in revolutionary wars to sap the fighting will of the people. Sholokhov has in fact worked in the service of all the imperialist armed aggressions. How can it be said that his heart belongs to the anti-fascist Soviet people or that his art serves the people?

With the 40th anniversary of the Soviet regime not far away, it is even more unpleasant to recall that we writers, in our creative efforts, lag behind life... However, each of us wishes to catch up with the times so that, in our creative work, we writers shall get into step with the Party and the people. That is why I, in particular, wish to finish *Virgin Soil Upturned* as soon as possible and then busy myself fully with the novel *They Fought for the Motherland*.

— "In Step with the Party and the People", published in *Pravda*, May 19, 1957

Comment: Every class which wants to seize state power starts with the moulding of public opinion. This is the case both with revolution and with counter-revolution. While plotting the restoration of capitalism in the socialist Soviet Union, the leaders of the CPSU, too, had first of all to shape public opinion and prepare the ideological conditions for this restoration. They desperately needed revisionist writers and artists to serve their revisionist line. In 1957, Khrushchov made a speech entitled "Literature and Art Must Maintain Close Ties with the Life of the People", in which he urged writers and artists to serve his revisionist politics. Sho-

lokhov immediately took the lead in writing articles to voice his support and declared that he would "get into step with" Khrushchov's revisionist Party. Sholokhov is indeed worthy of the name of Khrushchov's most enthusiastic accomplice.

I am not against innovation, but I am for reasonable, for discreet modernism.

— Sholokhov at a press conference, TASS
Moscow dispatch, November 30, 1965

Comment: Sholokhov has degenerated into a worshipper of Western bourgeois modernism and endorses it as a pattern for revisionist Soviet literature and art.

What is the calling, what are the tasks of an artist who considers himself not like a god indifferent to human suffering, raised up on Olympus above the fight between contending forces, but as a son of his own people and a small particle of humanity?

It is to speak honestly to his readers, to tell people the truth — truth at times harsh, but always courageous, to fortify in the hearts of men faith in the future, and faith in their capacity to build up that future. It is to be a fighter for peace all over the world and to nurture such fighters by his words wherever his words can reach. It is to unite people in their natural and noble strivings for progress. Art possesses great power to influence the mind and heart of man. I think that an artist deserves the name when he turns this power to the creation of the good in the souls of man, to the well-being of mankind.

— Sholokhov's speech at the ceremony awarding him the Nobel prize, published in *Pravda*, December 11, 1965

Comment: Imperialism is the source of modern wars. U.S. imperialism is the arch-enemy of the people of the world. This is today's grim truth. In the face of this truth, whether to call on the people to rise in tit-for-tat struggle against U.S. imperialism or to benumb their fighting will in order that they may surrender before U.S. imperialist aggression is a touchstone for distinguishing revolutionaries from counter-revolutionaries. Referring to the calling and tasks of artists, Sholokhov not only made no mention of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, but dared not utter even one word in denunciation of it. On the contrary, what he advocated was "to unite people in their natural and noble strivings for progress". This single remark fully lays bare his features as a renegade and reveals that his calling as an "artist" is to serve the capitulationist line of peaceful coexistence and the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression.

Needless to say, we would of course wish to greet our friend Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchov perhaps with bigger economic successes, with higher indices than those of this year. But I must say that it is not a guest in the usual sense of the word, but one of our nearest and dearest people, who has come to us. . . .

Dear Nikita Sergeevich! You are going to fly across the ocean. But this small part of the Soviet people here, and the entire Soviet people, and not only the Soviet people, will be with you in their thoughts. In the name of the people of Veshenskaya and of our dear guests from Stalingrad and Voronezh, I wish to assure you that we too will be with you there, in America. We wish you,

dear Nikita Sergeevich, good health and success in everything.

— Speech at the mass rally welcoming Khrushchov to Veshenskaya, published in *Pravda*, August 31, 1959

Comment: As is well known, Khrushchov went to meet the war-monger Eisenhower in 1959 with the fond dream of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world, to strike a criminal deal with him. In mortal fear that the deal would fall through, Sholokhov prayed and told his beads and wished Khrushchov "success in everything".

Many sincere thanks to the Central Committee of the Party, to the Soviet Government, for the high appreciation of my work as a writer expressed by Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchov in his speech in the township of Veshenskaya last year. . . .

I was in a somewhat embarrassing position in September last year, and therefore thanked Nikita Sergeevich with a more or less muffled voice. It was because I was the host then and he my guest, and it seemed to me rather inconvenient to express my thanks with a full voice. Now it is a quite different matter. Now I am in Moscow as your guest and can say with a full voice: thank you, dear Nikita Sergeevich! Thanks to all those whom I mentioned in my speech earlier, and thank you who are present here.

I know that when people receive awards, they usually promise to work well in the future. . . . But I can say like a man, firmly and with absolute confidence in my own

potentialities and capacities, that I shall, with my pen, serve my Party and my people with faith and truth!

—“Deep and Heartfelt Thanks”, a speech at the ceremony awarding the Lenin prize for literature in Kremlin in 1960, published in *Pravda*, July 17, 1960

Comment: How stubbornly Sholokhov clung to his renegade stand. He vowed that he would always “stand with” Khrushchov and would work for Khrushchov revisionism “firmly and with absolute confidence”.

II. ADVOCACY OF SOVIET-U.S. COLLABORATION AND CAPITULATION TO U.S. IMPERIALISM

So I shall arrive in America and say to the Americans: Let us go and visit each other like this. We have nothing to argue and fight with each other about; life is taking its own course all the same and bringing every one where he must come. Isn't it better to publish each other's books and arrange exhibitions and to acquaint our peoples with each other, than to let off cannon? It is exactly of this that I have talked with Nikita Sergeyeovich, who, sparing no efforts, is struggling for the preservation of peace all over the world.

—“We Have Nothing to Fight with Each Other About”, published in *Literary Gazette*, September 17, 1959

Comment: When Khrushchov went to the United States for his notorious Camp David talks with Eisenhower, he took Sholokhov along as a desirable companion so that this initiator of revisionism in literature could speak for him. And it turned out that Sholokhov lived up to Khrushchov's expectations. In his statement before the

trip, Sholokhov actually said, “We have nothing to argue and fight with each other about.” Is it not better for the Soviet Union and the United States to acquaint themselves with each other “than to let off cannon”? This is their confession of sham opposition but real capitulation to imperialism. As a matter of fact, there is a ceaseless life-and-death struggle raging between the imperialist and socialist countries and between the imperialists and the oppressed colonial peoples. To deny this struggle is to negate and oppose the revolution. There is nothing new in what Sholokhov said. He was only parroting and repeating Khrushchov's worn-out utterances. In fact, he has followed the lead of Khrushchov and thrown himself into the embrace of U.S. imperialism and become an out-and-out renegade.

Writers of the whole world should have a round table of their own. We may hold diverse views, but one thing unites us — the yearning to be of use to mankind.

.....
I would be very pleased to know what my American, British, West German and Japanese colleagues think of this.

.....
I write this letter, knowing that the time has come when, given goodwill and mutual respect, the all-round development of cultural ties can be given extensive scope; this, of course, only in case the efforts are mutual.

.....
I am convinced that given unanimity on the primary matters, all the rest will follow.

I am deeply convinced that we shall find a common language.

— Letter to the editorial board of the magazine *Foreign Literature*, published in *Pravda*, August 21, 1955

Question: You have called for a conference of writers in both East and West. What is your motive behind this?

Answer: I called in my own name for a conference of the writers of the world out of a series of considerations. I believe, first of all, that an individual is not in a position to resolve the tasks facing the intellectuals of the whole world today, even if he is a great authority. For this collective efforts are necessary.

Question: In your opinion, what should the conference of writers do?

Answer: The programme of the conference should likewise be prepared collectively. Although people of different political views will participate, I am convinced that they can find a common language and reach agreement on the course of their discussions. In my opinion, the conference should occupy itself with questions of literary creation and the struggle for an honest and unmercenary literature.

.....

As you know, the creative efforts of a writer are, in the first place, a matter of ethics, morality and humanism!

— “Say ‘No’ to War”, an interview with the editor of the Czechoslovak paper *Rude Pravo*, published in *Literary Gazette*, April 10, 1958

Comment: When Sholokhov said that “writers of the whole world should have a round table of their own”, he was taking an important step towards implementing

the Khrushchov revisionist line of “peaceful coexistence” and Soviet-U.S. collaboration in international cultural activities. Isn’t it most absurd to say that the hack writers of imperialism can have the yearning “to be of use to mankind”? If a writer representing the interests of the revolutionary people should “unite” with them and sit at “a round table” to find a “common language” with them, would he not become a renegade to the revolution, like Sholokhov? The talks about discussions on “the struggle for an honest and unmercenary literature”, and about the creative efforts of a writer being “in the first place a matter of ethics, morality and humanism” are just so much humbug aimed at selling out revolutionary principles. Sholokhov himself does not want revolution and opposes revolution, and he wants others to follow suit “collectively”. That is why he engineered the reactionary plot for a “round-table conference” between writers of the East and the West.

Mankind is not broken up into a multitude of scattered and isolated individuals floating in a state of weightlessness like spacemen who have left the sphere of gravity. We live on earth and are subject to terrestrial laws; as the Gospel says, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof, its cares, its needs and its hope for a better future. Huge sections of the population on earth are propelled by common aspirations and live by common interests; and these to a much larger degree unite than divide them.

— Sholokhov’s speech at the ceremony awarding him the Nobel prize, published in *Pravda*, December 11, 1965

Comment: Please note that Sholokhov says this at a time when the revolutionary anti-imperialist storm of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is raging with growing intensity. In the present-day world full of national oppression, of class oppression and of "man eating man", how can there be "common aspirations" or "common interests", to say nothing of things that "unite", as between the oppressor and oppressed nations, the ruling and the ruled classes, or between the man-eaters and those they devour? In the name of the Gospel, Sholokhov is trying to impose the revisionist desire for capitulation to imperialism on the people of the world. He obviously wants the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America to give up their revolutionary struggle, "unite" with the neo-colonialists and capitulate to U.S. imperialism and colonialism.

III. EXAGGERATION OF THE HORRORS OF WAR AND OPPOSITION TO THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD

"'War is the continuation of politics.' In this sense war is politics and war itself is a political action; since ancient times there has never been a war that did not have a political character."

"History knows only two kinds of war, just and unjust. We support just wars and oppose unjust wars. All counter-revolutionary wars are unjust, all revolutionary wars are just."

"War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of

human society, and in the not too distant future too. But there is only one way to eliminate it and that is to oppose war with war, to oppose counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war, to oppose national counter-revolutionary war with national revolutionary war, and to oppose counter-revolutionary class war with revolutionary class war."

This is the view of war according to Mao Tse-tung's thought — the acme of Marxism-Leninism in our epoch, living Marxism-Leninism at its highest. But the Khrushchov revisionists who have been scared to death by people's revolutionary war and by nuclear weapons shamelessly propagate the philosophy of survival, practise capitulationism and embellish U.S. imperialism to divert the people of the world from their struggle; they help it to conceal the danger of a new war and benumb the fighting will of the masses; they scare people with the threadbare argument that war would destroy mankind; they make no distinction between just and unjust wars and forbid others to make revolution; they preach the theory that weapons decide everything and they oppose revolutionary armed struggle, and so on. Being a parrot and mouthpiece of the Khrushchov revisionists, Sholokhov has exerted himself to the utmost and written articles spreading revisionist fallacies all over the place.

... War has entered the fate of every one of us with all the gravity attending the attempt of one nation thoroughly to destroy and annex another. Events at the front, the events of total war have left their indelible imprint on each of our lives. I lost my 70-year-old mother who was killed by a bomb dropped from a German plane when the Germans bombed a village of no strategic significance whatever to give effort to their robber calculations and aims; they simply wanted to disperse the population so that people would be unable to move their cattle to the steppes away from the approaching German army. My house and library have been burned down by German bombs. I have lost many professional friends and fellow-townsmen at the front. For a long time I was separated from my family. My son fell seriously ill during that period, and I had no way of helping my family. However, when all is said and done, this was a personal misfortune, personal sorrow for every one of us.

.....

Our country and our people have been covered with wounds by the war. Yet the fight is just beginning to flame.

—“A Letter to American Friends” (June 1943), *Collected Works of M. Sholokhov*, Moscow edition, 1959, Vol. 8

Comment: The year 1943 was the third year in which, under the command of Stalin, the Red Army and the masses of the awakened Soviet people were heroically resisting the aggression launched by the German fascists. However, Sholokhov, in a contemptible dark mood, focussed his attention upon personal misfortunes and losses. This utterly selfish individualist said, “Our

country and our people have been covered with wounds by the war.” He had completely lost courage and confidence in winning victory.

From the point of view of heroism, exploits in war naturally appear more impressive, but I must tell you that no war can create anything. War is a destroyer, while labour is a creative exploit....

— Sholokhov meets youth, under the headline “There Is Always Room for Exploits in Life”, published in *Literary Gazette*, April 24, 1965

Comment: We hold that imperialism is the source of modern wars. The Second World War was provoked and launched by Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo and other fascist chieftains and by international monopoly capital, which they represented. It is they who spread suffering and misfortune. Speaking of hatred, one should hate the war-mongers who start unjust wars, the German, Italian and Japanese fascists of yesterday and the U.S. imperialists and all reactionaries of today. One must never oppose all wars in the abstract. What is more important, hatred should be turned into strength and action to oppose and eliminate the source of wars itself, that is, the imperialist system. As for the arguments that war is “a destroyer” of mankind and “no war can create anything”, they are sheer fallacies which make no distinction between right and wrong. Was it not the guns of the *Aurora* which proclaimed the victory of the October Revolution, turning one-sixth of the globe Red and ushering in a new era in human history? From malicious

motives, the renegade Sholokhov deliberately covers up these great exploits.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." He has also said, "War has educated the people and it is the people who will win the war, win the peace and win progress." But all the Khrushchov revisionists hate people's revolutionary war; they want to protect their own privileged position as a newly emerging bourgeoisie, and that is why they flagrantly slander and deny the just nature of revolutionary war.

We live in such a complex time, when even preparations for war spell danger for all the inhabitants of our planet.

We are against the "cold war". We are against weapons of mass slaughter. Let people destroy nuclear weapons rather than let those horrible weapons wipe millions of lives from the face of the earth.

Man has no right to allow the sun to be obscured by murderous clouds of radioactive dust, to allow the air to become lethal. We are born to live and we shall live!

— "Soldiers of My Motherland", in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the Soviet armed forces, published in *Pravda*, February 23, 1958

Comment: Sholokhov is also an apologist for the "philosophy of survival". Just look at the horrors of the nuclear weapon in his description! In his view, the people must not make revolution, for revolution would bring about a nuclear war and mankind would face self-destruction.

Therefore, in order to "live", in order that "we shall live", one must not touch a single hair of imperialism. But the revolutionary people maintain, "The atom bomb is a paper tiger which the U.S. reactionaries use to scare people. It looks terrible, but in fact it isn't. Of course, the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two new types of weapon." Only the people are invincible, and only the people's revolution can eliminate imperialism.

We live in troubled years. But there is no people on earth that would desire war. There are forces which plunge whole nations into the flames of war. Is it possible for the ashes of war, the ashes of the vast fires of World War II, not to beat in the writer's heart? Can an honest-minded writer refrain from raising his voice against those who want to condemn mankind to self-destruction?

— Sholokhov's speech at the ceremony awarding him the Nobel prize, published in *Pravda*, December 11, 1965

Comment: While clamouring against all wars, the renegade Sholokhov dare not clearly point out that the source of war is the imperialist system, is U.S. imperialism. He only talks in general terms of "forces which plunge whole nations into the flames of war" and says that there are "those who want to condemn mankind to self-destruction", and so on. These words reveal his timidity and cowardice as well as his ugly visage, the visage of one who, in co-ordination with U.S. imperialism, maliciously makes indirect and veiled attacks on the revolutionary people.

The sooner the decision concerning general disarmament ripens in all governments, the sweeter will be this fruit for the peoples of the globe. The sooner the shameful colonial system is buried, the more happily will the people breathe. This, perhaps, will be the only funeral at which few tears will be shed and millions of people will rejoice and be happy.

—“An Excellent Speech”, published in *Izvestia*, September 29, 1960

Comment: Sholokhov talks just like a priest who preaches that along with “general disarmament”, everything else will come as well — colonialism will be “buried” and the oppressed nations and people will “breathe happily”, “rejoice and be happy”. But as we all know, in reality “general disarmament” is but empty talk so far as imperialism is concerned.

Chairman Mao has said, “When we say ‘imperialism is ferocious’, we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.” Therefore, it is the duty of the revolutionaries to fight against the imperialist policies of aggression and war, expose their swindles and frustrate their plots, and to educate the masses and raise their political consciousness.

We begin our meeting on a significant day. In Moscow today the nuclear test ban treaty will be signed. And I am thinking: “Great statesmen and diplomats have come to an agreement. Can it be that we writers will fail to reach agreement on how to serve man and the cause of peace better with our art? It would be an outright shame

for us in the face of our readers. . . . It is imperative to find a common language and it will surely be found!”

—“Serve the People with Honour”, an opening speech at the Leningrad meeting of the European Association of Writers, published in *Literary Gazette*, August 6, 1963

Comment: When Khrushchov signed the nuclear test ban treaty with the imperialists, a treaty which betrayed the interests of the socialist camp and the revolutionary people throughout the world, Sholokhov immediately came out to speak for him, shouting himself hoarse and joining hands with the imperialist “Western writers” on “reaching agreement on how to serve man and the cause of peace”. How harmoniously these two renegades sang their duet, one on and the other off stage!

At a time when war preparations are being accelerated not only in West Germany where atomic weapons are being slipped into the hands of the fascists, but everywhere else in the world. It is necessary to go into action collectively. Literature is a matter of conscience. Future generations will not forgive us if we do not raise our voices against the slaughter. . . .

Those who say “NO!” to war should be first of all the intellectuals, and they should say it before any one else says “YES!”

—“Say ‘No’ to War”, an interview with the editor of the Czechoslovak paper *Rude Pravo*, published in *Literary Gazette*, April 10, 1958

Comment: Look! Not only does Sholokhov want no revolution, he even forbids others to make revolution.

This is his very soul. It is, therefore, no wonder that Sholokhov should be the first to say "NO" when the people call for revolutionary war. Sholokhov is just an active apologist for imperialism and colonialism.

IV. THE RENEGADE'S "REWARD"

Sholokhov, a "member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" and a "proletarian writer", has consistently slandered the Soviet people and attacked the socialist system. For a long time he has spread a lot of bourgeois reactionary ideas. Since Khrushchov's usurpation of the leadership of the CPSU and pursuit of the revisionist line, Sholokhov has become particularly blatant in opposing the national liberation movement and the proletarian revolution, reviling the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world and doing his utmost to defend colonialism and the reactionary rule of imperialism. This is precisely the immediate political reason why he has won the commendation of the Western reactionary bourgeoisie, which has conferred upon him the highest bourgeois award, the Nobel prize. The Nobel prize for literature, as a "Western instrument", was awarded to the notorious Russian bourgeois reactionary writer, Ivan Bunin, and another notorious Soviet renegade, Boris Pasternak. Sholokhov once perfunctorily expressed his "anger" at these

awards to renegades, condemning Pasternak as "an internal émigré". But before long the same Sholokhov was moved to tears at receiving the very Nobel prize for literature which he had condemned as being awarded to "an internal émigré"! Thus, he has slapped his own face hard and fully revealed what a shameless hypocrite he is! Gathered here are the "angry statements" he had made earlier and the words he said with such gratitude and elation when he received the Nobel prize. Readers comparing them will see to what political and spiritual depths Sholokhov, the protagonist of Soviet modern revisionist literature and art, has degraded himself!

(1)

Laureate of the Nobel prize M. A. Sholokhov sent the following telegram to the Royal Academy in Stockholm:

I sincerely thank you for your high appraisal of my literary work and the award of the Nobel prize. Meanwhile, I accept with gratitude your kind invitation to come to Stockholm for the Nobel festival.

Mikhail Sholokhov
October 18, 1965

— Published in *Pravda*, October 19, 1965

To the question "How did you come to know that you have been awarded the prize?" Sholokhov answered:

I learned the news from a telegram from Swedish correspondents. But a little late. The telegram was

delivered to me by the secretary of the Furmanov district committee of the Party, Comrade Mandaliev, who found me 140 kilometres away from the district centre. In order to send a reply to the Swedish Royal Academy, I had to go by plane to Uralsk in rather complicated weather conditions. Well, in general, October 15 turned out to be a lucky day for me in all respects. At dawn I worked successfully on a chapter of the first part of the novel [*They Fought for the Motherland*], a chapter devilishly difficult. . . . In the evening I learned of the award of the prize, and during the evening hunting I brought down two marvellous grey geese with two shots (the only ones in the twilight). What is more, I got them at the maximum range. And this does not happen often!

— Interview with *Pravda* correspondent, published in *Pravda*, October 22, 1965

Answering questions put by newsmen about his reactions at being awarded the Nobel prize, Sholokhov said that the news had called forth “a faint smile and a silent sigh — a little late”.

— Sholokhov at a press conference in Moscow after being adjudged the 1965 Nobel prize, TASS Moscow dispatch, November 30, 1965

At this solemn meeting I consider it my pleasant duty once more to express my gratitude to the Swedish Royal Academy which has awarded me the Nobel prize.

I have already had the opportunity to testify publicly that this has aroused feelings of satisfaction in me not only as an international recognition of my professional services and characteristics as a man of letters. I take

pride in the fact that the prize was awarded a Russian, a Soviet writer. I represent here my motherland's large contingent of writers.

— Sholokhov's speech at the ceremony awarding him the Nobel prize, published in *Pravda*, December 11, 1965

(2)

Stockholm, Nov. 1, 1958 (*Reuter*) — Mikhail Sholokhov, the well-known Soviet writer, was quoted today by the Stockholm evening paper *Aftonbladet* as saying that it was just to exclude Boris Pasternak from the Soviet Writers Association.

.....
The interview, granted to the newspaper by telephone, was tape-recorded. Sholokhov said that the Pasternak novel, *Dr. Zhivago* was undoubtedly anti-Soviet, and attacks on the Swedish Academy by the Soviet Writers Association and *Pravda* were, in his opinion, therefore justified.

Exclusion from the association, he added, “is not designed to harass a person economically but to make his conscience speak. His patriotic conscience. Pasternak has made his living by writing poetry and translating. I presume he will continue to do so.

“But it is not my concern to judge Pasternak's fate. His fate is not mine.”

This may be noted in all clarity in the history of contemporary literature. However talented Bunin was in prose and poetry, he is nearly forgotten and little known to our wide reading public, and to youth in particular.

And this is not because Bunin's works have not been reprinted in our country. . . . But Gorky and Serafimovich will not be forgotten. They were Bunin's contemporaries and came to literature at the same time as he, yet they served the people differently. So their works are assessed differently. Bunin was awarded the Nobel prize for *The Life of Arseniev*, while a work such as Gorky's *The Life of Klim Samgin*, which was splendidly done and encyclopedic in its breadth of scope and delineation of all the pre-revolutionary sections and strata of Tsarist Russia, was ignored by the Swedish Academy.

In exactly the same way, Gorky's outstanding novel *The Artamonovs* fell out of the purview of the Swedish connoisseurs of art. The same applies to Serafimovich's *The Iron Flood* and many other significant Soviet prose works.

As you see, evaluation [of works of literature] in the international arena as well is dictated by class interests. And even in this light, the light of literary evaluation, the bourgeois theoreticians' assertion that art by its very nature is above all classes appears false. . . .

— Speech at the meeting commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of A. S. Serafimovich, published in *Pravda*, January 22, 1963

Comment: Here Sholokhov rightly said that "evaluation [of works of literature] in the international arena is dictated by class interests". In assessing works of literature and art the proletariat has proletarian criteria and the bourgeoisie has bourgeois criteria. The reason is that "in the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines"

(Mao Tse-tung, Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art) and that all literature and art serve the politics and class interests of definite classes. So it is no accident that the reactionary bourgeoisie patronizes Sholokhov's black wares.

THE TRUE FEATURES OF THE RENEGADE SHOLOKHOV

By Tsai Hui

The laws of history are extremely harsh. At critical moments of struggle, they relentlessly force opportunists and renegades of every description to discard their masks and expose their true features. This is what has happened in the case of Mikhail A. Sholokhov. In October 1965, in a state of awed excitement the "Communist" and "proletarian writer" Sholokhov accepted the Nobel prize for literature which even the French bourgeois writer Jean-Paul Sartre had turned down. In Sartre's words, to accept the prize would be to receive "a distinction reserved for the writers of the West or for the traitors of the East".

Ever since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the organization in charge of awarding the Nobel prize for literature has been seeking in a hundred and one ways for "traitors of the East" among Russian writers. They ostentatiously proclaim how very much they value "literary talents", but they never recognize the literary talents of Gorky whom Lenin praised. The only "talents" among Russian writers they approve, take pains to seek out and lavish their awards on are those who obdurately oppose communism and the October Socialist Revolution.

In 1933, in other words in the sixteenth year after the victory of the October Revolution, the Nobel prize committee gave the prize for literature to a Russian writer for the first time. That writer was not Gorky or any other author who supported the socialist revolution. It was the émigré Russian writer Ivan Bunin, who bitterly hated the October Revolution and fled to live in Paris.

In 1958, with the same kind of political motivation the committee gave the prize to that other notorious traitor, Boris Pasternak, the author of the anti-communist novel *Dr. Zhivago*. Taking advantage of this, reactionaries all over the world stirred up an anti-Soviet, anti-communist wave. The Western bourgeois press showed great appreciation of the role played by the Nobel prize for literature, and the Vienna paper *Kurier* bluntly called it "the Nobel prize against communism". At that time, the Soviet people angrily denounced the Nobel prize for literature as a "Western instrument", and unanimously condemned Pasternak's traitorous behaviour. On October 26 of that year the Soviet paper *Pravda* found it necessary to declare that "the man to whom the reactionary bourgeoisie awarded the Nobel prize" was "one who had slandered the socialist revolution and the Soviet people". Even Sholokhov, though reluctantly, felt forced to take a stand and denounce Pasternak as "an internal émigré".

It is most ironic that not so many years later Sholokhov has now gratefully accepted the Nobel prize for literature which he himself once condemned as having been awarded to "an internal émigré". Of course, the "talented" Sholokhov would not be so stupid as to admit that what he has accepted is a reward for traitors. Indeed, he and the handful of modern revisionist writers he represents have been doing all they can to make the Soviet people

believe that the nature of the Nobel prize for literature has changed and that it has become extraordinarily "unbiased". Speaking to a UPI correspondent, a leading member of the Union of Soviet Writers even had the impudence to describe the award as "a great prize for socialist literature". The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR also stepped forward and spoke of it as "another proof of the world's recognition . . . of the indisputable achievements of socialist realist literature".

Enough, worthy sorcerers! However brilliant your sleight-of-hand, your elation arising from the unexpected condescension shown to you by the prize awarded to Sholokhov has caused you to overlook an important fact, namely, that Anders Osterling, chairman of the Nobel Committee of the Swedish Academy of Sciences, had already given a public explanation of why they awarded him the prize. And the reason is not that they have changed their position but that "although Mr. Sholokhov is a convinced Communist, he kept ideological comment completely out of his great, four-volume work [*And Quiet Flows the Don*]".

Well, now, have you not — you, the leaders of the Central Committee of the CPSU and ministers of the USSR Council of Ministers, and you, the important and the not so important commentators of the Soviet Union — have you not been making categorical statements that the Nobel prize award to Sholokhov shows "recognition" of "socialist realist literature" and is "a great prize for socialist literature"? So now it is clear that your much advertised "socialist literature" is that kind of literature — a literature, so-called, "with no ideological tendency" and "standing above classes" which is encouraged by the

bourgeoisie. You glibly profess to abide by Lenin's principles. Yet you have clean forgotten Lenin's slogans: "Down with non-partisan writers! Down with literary supermen!" Is there not profound irony in this?

In fact, there is no such thing as literature that "keeps out ideological comment completely", that "stands above classes". These are simply literary terms used by the bourgeoisie and the revisionists to fool readers, to mislead them and cover up the despicable purpose of serving imperialism and the bourgeoisie. In the present-day world, all literature and art are those of a particular class and conform to a particular political line; hence, they necessarily propagandize a particular ideology and have a particular political tendency. The literature which the bourgeoisie and the revisionists style as being unrelated to ideology in reality spreads bourgeois, reactionary ideology in a hundred and one ways and has a reactionary political tendency.

Sholokhov's *And Quiet Flows the Don* is precisely a "great work" of this sort. When this novel is analysed from the Marxist viewpoint, the class viewpoint, it is not difficult to see that one important reason why Sholokhov's name is listed together with Boris Pasternak's on the "roll of Nobel prize winners for literature" is that his "great four-volume work" produces the same kind of effect as Pasternak's *Dr. Zhivago*, although it does so in a different way. If in *Dr. Zhivago* Pasternak paints a vicious picture of the "ruin" of the Russian intelligentsia in the new society and hurls all kinds of slanders at the Soviet Red Army and the new life after the October Revolution through his portrayal of Zhivago, an old Russian bourgeois intellectual who detests the October Revolution and the socialist system, then it is equally true

that in his novel *And Quiet Flows the Don*, through his undisguised praise of Grigory, the counter-revolutionary who frenziedly fought the Red Army and committed many sanguinary crimes, Sholokhov venomously attacks the October Socialist Revolution and the "inhumanity" of class struggle and directly curses revolutionary wars, asserting that the "fine soul" of Grigory was crushed and he was robbed of everything which could "connect him with the world he lives in", and the peaceful, happy and tranquil life of the Melekhov family was ruined.

At the recent 23rd Congress of the CPSU which began with a fanfare, Sholokhov condemned certain Soviet writers as renegades and said, "There is nothing so foul and base as slandering one's own mother, vilely insulting her and raising one's hand against her." But in fact, do not these words fit Sholokhov himself? Two decades ago, through his *And Quiet Flows the Don* he was already vilifying the path of the October Revolution; he was already raising his hand against his own "mother", against Lenin, Stalin, and the Great October Socialist Revolution!

With its own unique class sensitivity, the bourgeois press of the United States has clearly recognized the violently anti-communist ideology in *And Quiet Flows the Don* and has consequently appraised it very highly. When Sholokhov received the Nobel prize for literature, the *Saturday Review* animatedly declared that this Russian prize winner "represents those very Don Cossacks who had fought against the Red Army" and that he "has voiced through his fictional characters certain doubts about communist dogmas and practices". It is not hard to see that the reactionary Western bourgeoisie regard Sholokhov with favour for precisely this major reason and for no other.

Worthy of deeper thought is the question why the Western bourgeoisie did not choose Sholokhov earlier, when he was previously put forward as a candidate for the Nobel prize for literature twenty years ago (in 1946), why they only "discovered" his "talents" nineteen years later (in 1965). What is the key to this mystery?

Truth to tell, the reason is very simple. After all, until the Khrushchov revisionists usurped the leadership of the Soviet Union, Sholokhov was not bold enough to come out fully in his true colours. Although the Western bourgeoisie greatly appreciated his *And Quiet Flows the Don*, they could not as yet trust him completely, and so they took a wait-and-see attitude. In those days, even though he had already attacked revolutionary wars and the October Revolution in his novel, Sholokhov still felt obliged on occasion to utter a few sanctimonious words in praise of the October Revolution and of Stalin. Like Khrushchov, he used to call Stalin his "father". On Stalin's death in 1953, Sholokhov cried out hypocritically: "Father, farewell, farewell for ever, dear father whom I warmly loved throughout my life!" and he swore to store up for Stalin "sacred condolences in my heart for ever".

Yet soon after, at the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956, he publicly threw himself into the embrace of Khrushchov who was wildly attacking Stalin, and he closely collaborated with Khrushchov in unbridled attacks on Fadeyev, one of the chief leaders of the CPSU in the sphere of literature during the period of Stalin's leadership. Then he came out with his short story *Fate of a Man* which may be described as a pattern of modern revisionist literature, and he became Khrushchov's bell-wether in spreading revisionism in the field of Soviet literature and art. Thereafter, wherever Khrushchov

flew, Sholokhov was always there, as he had sworn, "together" with him "ideologically". Still more revoltingly, this same Sholokhov brazenly announced at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU that he felt a kind of "reticent" "masculine, friendly love" for Khrushchov.

Naturally Khrushchov and his successors also showed exceptional appreciation of this faithful mouthpiece, whose role is a special one. For not only does he have the title of "Party author", but he is a Stalin prize winner and has long been a deputy to the Supreme Soviet. At least for a time this combination of titles can mislead and play a certain deceptive role among some Soviet people and some personalities in international cultural circles who do not know the real facts.

Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world is the soul of the Khrushchov revisionist line. This is why Sholokhov has been working hard to peddle the wares of the Soviet-U.S. cultural merger among Soviet readers and in international cultural circles, for which he has become an eager fugleman. Inside the Soviet Union on the one hand, he has been actively spreading bourgeois ideology, the bourgeois theory of human nature and the bourgeois notion of liberty, equality and fraternity; he has been instilling into the mass of Soviet readers reactionary bourgeois ideas of individualism, humanitarianism and pacifism. And on the other hand, he has completely changed his "hermit-like" way of life and has repeatedly gone abroad on propaganda missions, everywhere prodding writers of the oppressed nations and oppressed classes to take "united action" and "express opinions collectively" with imperialist and bourgeois writers. Towards the same end he has pleaded to U.S. imperialism: "Let us go and visit each other like this. We have

nothing to argue and fight with each other about." Thus, at a European conference of writers, he appealed with all his might for writers to "reach agreement" and "find a common language . . . just as the great statesmen and diplomats" of the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain were doing.

What is his motive? He is out to protect the interests of the ruling cliques both in the Soviet Union and in the United States and to prevent people from rising up in revolution. Sholokhov is indiscriminately against every kind of war; whether it is a revolutionary war waged by oppressed people or a war of liberation waged by an invaded nation, he invariably wants the writers of the world to be the first to rush forward and say "No", and to speak up before those who say "Yes". In short, not only has he turned traitor to revolution himself, but he forbids others to rise up in revolution. And not only does he himself forbid revolutions but he wants all the writers of the world "to unite" and "collectively" proscribe them.

These are the services for which Sholokhov has won the prize award of the reactionary Western bourgeoisie as well as the special favour of Khrushchov and his successors.

The facts are clear. The nature of the Nobel prize which the Soviet people have dubbed a "Western instrument" has not changed, but Sholokhov has completely discarded his fig-leaf and stands revealed as a "Western instrument". The reactionary bourgeoisie has finally found a more useful "traitor of the East" than Boris Pasternak.

Let us tell Sholokhov and the handful of modern revisionist writers and artists he represents: Do not crow too

soon. Do not get conceited too soon! You have openly betrayed the cause of the proletarian revolution, and for this reason you will surely be cast aside by the Soviet people and all the revolutionary people of the world. The wheel of history is merciless in crushing all obstacles in its path of advance. Full of youthfulness and vitality, the revolutionary cause of the proletariat and all the oppressed people of the world will surely sweep through the world with the momentum of an avalanche and the force of a thunderbolt. Proletarian revolutionary literature and art will surely grow in vigour in the course of struggle and will always serve as the war drum and the clarion, inspiring the people to rise up in struggle.

(*Wenyi Bao*, No. 5, 1966)

ERRATA

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	
8	14	<i>For "a unscrupulous" read "an unscrupulous"</i>
10	23	<i>For "he became" read "he becomes"</i>
13	last	<i>For "All that lives." read "All that lives,"</i>
19	26	<i>For "enemy of people" read "enemy of the people"</i>