

SMASH THE COUNTERATTACKS OF BOURGEOIS
REACTIONARY LINE

[Following is a translation of an article by the Red-in-the-East Combat Team, Ching-kang-shan War School, Peiping, originally entitled "Resolutely Smash the Counterattacks of the Bourgeois Reactionary Line -- Thoroughly Criticize the Article Entitled Middle School Students Question the Central Committee's Cultural Revolution," in the Chinese-language newspaper Hung-wei-ping Pao, [Peiping?], No. 15, 22 December 1966, p 3.]

The above-mentioned article quotes at its very beginning from the record of Chairman Mao's words, stating to boot, "We revolutionary descendants listen most attentively to the words of Chairman Mao, follow him most closely, and work hardest to conduct all business according to Mao Tse-tung's thinking." But in the article there is abundant evidence everywhere of the disregard of Mao Tse-tung's thinking, the unreasonable criticism of the first part of the Cultural Revolution from the standpoint of the bourgeois reactionary line, the false accusation of the movement, and the malicious attack on the Sub-Committee in charge. The article is a specimen of the work of some in middle schools insisting on the bourgeois reactionary line. The mistaken viewpoints of these people must be thoroughly criticized.

The gist of the first point raised in the article is that in middle schools certain organizations and certain people have, under the pretext of criticizing the bourgeois reactionary line, made all kinds of attacks on revolutionary comrades with a view to attaining personal ends. For this reason "this great movement of criticism has been vulgarized." "The

opposition between different organizations has been revived and deepened, a large-scale struggle of the masses with the masses provoked, and the target in the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line diverted."

These remarks are not convincing, since they are not based on the facts, and in fact they cannot apply universally. Those who criticize the bourgeois reactionary line with personal axes to grind are only in the minority. In schools, in which the influence of the bourgeois reactionary line has been comparatively deep in the past, the small minority who support that line will never be contented with failure. They will deceive the masses with new tricks and bring pressure to bear on the revolutionary masses who criticize the said line. This is probably the condition stated in the article. But it is not a question of "vulgarizing" the movement. It is the continuation of the struggle between the two lines and a sign of its aggravation and sharpening.

We must see that since the publication of the sixteen articles and especially since that of the Editorial in No. 13 of the periodical Hung-ch'i, the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao has exerted a profound influence on the broad masses, and innumerable students have had the determination to make a thorough criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line and eliminate its evil influence completely. The present development of the movement in middle schools fully bears this out. The facts prove that in many schools, which have been subjected to the sharp criticisms of the bourgeois reactionary line, the revolutionary minority have risen to launch the mass criticism of, and struggle with, that line, the masses are awakening, and many students who have been deceived have started to return to the correct line. In middle schools the mass criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line is being vehemently stirred up. However, the author of the above-mentioned article has only seen subjectively and one-sidedly the partial condition of a small number of schools and failed to see the entire picture of Peiping Municipality. He has only seen the dark side and overlooked the bright side, i. e., the great victory already won in society by Chairman Mao's correct line and the violent struggle with the bourgeois reactionary line energetically launched by the revolutionary minority in middle schools now. We must firmly remember the following teachings of Chairman Mao: "In short the future is bright, though the road is tortuous. The difficulties lying before us are still numerous, and we should not overlook them. Let us unite with all our people and make a joint effort, and then we can overcome all our difficulties and reach our objective of victory."

The article referred to above goes on to say, "Nobody has ever paid attention to the movement in middle schools at the present stage. Can the Central Committee's Cultural Revolution shut its eyes and turn a deaf ear to this phenomena?" Let us ask the writer of the article exactly in what way we can be said to be concerned with the movement in middle schools. Is it only after the Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution has visited each and every middle school that it can be said to have penetrated into the basic strata and understood their condition? Were the editorials of the periodical Hung-ch'i and the newspaper Jen-min Jih-pao not enough to give some guidance? Did each concrete problem have to be solved by the sub-committee? Evidently, in the view of the writer, it is necessary to send working parties everywhere to take care of everything, and only then can it constitute "solicitude and attention." Under these circumstances how can business be conducted according to the sixteen articles and how can self-education and self-liberation be achieved by the masses in this movement of the great Cultural Revolution?

It is also said in the article, "Some people take the commission of mistakes for the implementation of the bourgeois reactionary line. In short, such a solemn struggle has been simplified and aggravated by certain people in the schools." But this is not in fact the condition presented by the majority of schools. According to the writer of the article, the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line has only been "simplified" and "aggravated" by some. As a matter of fact, in many schools, those who insist on the bourgeois reactionary line have made use of the slogan "Oppose the bourgeois reactionary line" to deceive the people, seeking to divert the target of the struggle, to provoke with new formulas the mass struggle with the masses, and to continue to oppress the revolutionary minority. This is a manifestation of the increased complexity of the struggle between the two lines. Where mistakes arise, a concrete analysis of them should be made. If the mistake lies in the direction or line taken, what is implemented must be the bourgeois reactionary line. On the other hand, if it is not a mistake of direction, we are of course not entitled to make a false accusation. But without destruction nothing can be constructed. If we do not thoroughly criticize the bourgeois reactionary line, we cannot establish the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao.

In the latter part of the article it says, "We have not even spared our lives to study Chairman Mao's works, including the articles entitled "Study and the Current Situation" and "Concerning Certain Resolutions on Historical Questions." Let us then study the following passage: "The method of thinking

of the petite bourgeoisie is basically to manifest subjectivity and one-sidedness in the observation of problems, i. e., not to proceed from the objective and total condition of the ratio of class strengths, but to take one's own subjective wishes, feelings, and empty talks as realities, to take the partial as the total, and the trees as the wood." The latter is exactly a description of the manner in which the author sees his problems. He has oversimplified a complex class struggle.

With regard to the second question posed by the article, it says, "Some comrades of the Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution have constantly made statements from their positions high above, giving one side their strong support and regarding it as the firm left wing of the revolution, and expressing dissatisfaction with the other side, giving rise to a situation, even on a larger scale than before, in which one faction oppresses another." We disagree completely with this attack on, and slander of, the sub-committee. We cannot help asking: On what basis does the writer of the article make his observations? According to what you say, has not the sub-committee become a unit for the implementation of the bourgeois reactionary line? Has it not become the chief culprit in the suppression of a mass movement? What was your motive in writing this article? Under the pretext of presenting your views, you sought actually to overthrow the sub-committee. You used the beautiful names of "criticism and supervision" and "responsibility to the revolution." But were you really responsible to the revolution? No, absolutely not!

You took the bourgeois stand entirely, to bombard the headquarters of the proletariat. The Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution supports Chairman Mao firmly, supports Mao Tse-tung's thinking firmly, resolutely implements the correct line of the great Proletarian Cultural Revolution represented by Chairman Mao, resolutely supports the sixteen articles for that revolution, and adamantly opposes the counterrevolutionary revisionism and the bourgeois reactionary line. The sub-committee is led by Comrades Ch'en Po-ta, K'ang Sheng, and Chiang Ch'ing, Chairman Mao's intimate comrades-in-arms. We firmly support the correct leadership of the sub-committee, and the broad masses of revolutionaries also do likewise.

Comrades of the sub-committee penetrate into the masses, and they do not express their views until after investigation. But they are correct in resolutely supporting one of the sides and in affirming that it is the left wing of the revolution. For when the struggle between the two lines gets to be extremely violent, how can the comrades of the sub-committee refrain from stepping forward to give their resolute support to the

revolutionary minority insisting on the correct line of Chairman Mao? Only by acting in this way can the party's correct leadership be manifested. As to the situation that existed before, in which the majority oppressed the minority, this was not the result of statements made by comrades of the sub-committee. Because the majority implemented the mistaken line, it was inevitable for the majority to oppress and oppose the minority.

The writer also held the sub-committee responsible for the failure of middle school students to study Chairman Mao's works thoroughly. He said that statements made by members of the sub-committee were quickly reprinted and studied, thus preventing the students from studying the Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung. This was of course all nonsense. It completely lays bare the malicious motive of the author. How can someone self-consciously studying Chairman Mao's selected works give them up just because some superiors have made certain statements? Those who entertain deep class feelings toward Chairman Mao's works can under no circumstances put them aside.

The article has stated openly, "In short, in a word, Mao Tse-tung's thinking does not stand out prominently enough." Such is the appraisal made by the author and his group of the sub-committee. In our view the sub-committee is a body, which holds aloft the great red flag of Mao Tse-tung's thinking and resolutely implements Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. Whoever opposes the sub-committee opposes Chairman Mao and is counterrevolutionary, and we must crush his dog's head.

At the moment there has appeared in society a counter-current against the sub-committee and the Cultural Revolution. This is the counterattack and desperate struggle staged by the bourgeois reactionary line. Chairman Mao has warned us thus: "Anything reactionary will not fall until you strike it," and "All mistaken thinking, all poison weeds, all demons and monsters should be criticized, and we must not let them become a free-flowing inundation." Faced with the counterattack of the bourgeois reactionary line, we can only beat it back and overthrow it, and we must not let it develop further.

The article says that thorough exposures and criticisms have been made "with regard to the question of struggling with those in authority and working parties taking the capitalist road." It is very clear to all of us that when the working parties were first withdrawn from the schools, the poison injected by them in many institutions had not been eliminated. The line adopted by the working parties had its influence on many people. The bogus cultural revolution made possible entirely by the working parties implemented their mistaken line.

They continued to oppress the revolutionary minority and provoked the struggle of the masses with the masses. How could we say at that time, "thorough exposures and criticisms have been made with regard to the question of dealing with the black gang and those in authority and the working parties taking the capitalist road"? It is really something strange. Moreover, according to the article, there was fundamentally no need for the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line.

However, the contradiction is in what follows immediately in the article: "Ever since Chairman Mao made the announcement on the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line, the Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution has never made any clear indication and given very good guidance as to how the middle schools should criticize the bourgeois reactionary line...So, the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line in middle schools has never followed the right track." Here we cannot help asking the writer: Since you regarded the first part of the movement as basically normal, implementing the revolutionary line, why was it necessary for the Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution of the Central Committee to guide you in the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line? What did you have to criticize? You said that before Chairman Mao's call your movement had been basically normal, and that after Chairman Mao's call, the Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution did not make any clear indication and prevented the movement of the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line from following the right track. What was your motive in writing all this?

The article also says, "Word got around in society that the school revolutionary committees and the Red Guards earliest established engaged in struggle, criticism, and transformation, which had the correct direction; and that as a result some people regarded this as reasonable and ceased to have interest in the struggle with those in authority taking the capitalist road, merely clinging steadfastly to the working party..." Comrades, as we read up to this point, let us open No. 13 of the periodical Hung-ch'i and go over the editorial, which pointed out, "The bourgeois reactionary line must be thoroughly criticized. Only by thoroughly criticizing it can its influence be eradicated. Only thus can the sixteen articles of the proletarian be implemented. Only thus can the struggle, criticism, and transformation in society, in schools, and in other cultural departments be carried out under the guidance of the correct line. Only thus can it be decided with whom to struggle, what to criticize, and what to transform. Only thus can it be known whom to rely on to carry out the struggle, criticism, and transformation. Only thus can these tasks be fulfilled."

However, the author of the article only harped on "those clinging steadfastly to the question of the working party," without even mentioning the thorough criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line. Again what was your motive? Could you very well blame the revolutionary students insisting on the correct line, who, for the sake of protecting the party Central Committee and Chairman Mao and carrying the Cultural Revolution to the end, clung steadfastly to the working party and thoroughly criticized the bourgeois reactionary line implemented by it? Could you say that with the guidance of the mistaken line you could also make the great Proletarian Cultural Revolution "have a basically normal development"?

In its fourth section on "The Guidance of the Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution Is Insufficient," the article has had this to say: "We feel that the guidance of comrades of the Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution with regard to unity in accordance with Mao Tse-tung's thinking is insufficient, (for example, no editorial with regard to guidance has been published, so that the divergence between the two sides has been deepened.)

Before you wrote this article, Comrades, did you not study the editorials of Nos. 13 and 14 of the periodical Hung-ch'i? These editorials have told us very clearly that at the present stage of the great Cultural Revolution "the bourgeois reactionary line must be thoroughly criticized." They go on to say, "Those comrades who have committed mistakes in their direction and in the line they have taken must face their mistakes in a proper spirit, correct them, and return to the correct stand and the correct line, and not develop themselves to the point of opposition to the party." All comrades who have committed mistakes, if they act according to these editorials, can certainly unite with comrades insisting on the correct line under the great red flag of Mao Tse-tung's thinking. Can we say that these editorials have given no guidance?

The article says further, "We maintain that what has been criticized in the schools is not really the bourgeois reactionary line, but consists largely of workers and peasants, revolutionary cadres, revolutionary servicemen, and descendants of revolutionary martyrs turned students..." We regard this statement as erroneous. When Chairman Mao issued the call for the criticism of the bourgeois reactionary line, revolutionary students rose at once to open fire on the bourgeois reactionary line and to criticize the working party and the reactionary line implemented by the revolutionary committee created by it. This was revolutionary action, which could by no means be condemned. They engaged in their criticism and struggle in accordance with the objectives set by Chairman

Mao, i.e., "not only to clarify thinking, but to unify comrades." How can it be said that there was any intention to criticize students with good backgrounds?

The article also says, "Did these 'little generals', who first rose up in revolt and who harbored implecable hatred for the class enemy, seek to create struggles, criticisms, and transformations for the revolutionary committee? Was it possible that they would not support and implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary line?" This means that those comrades who have good backgrounds can never commit any mistakes in choosing the line they take and are sure to implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. We say that this view takes the composition of a certain group too much for granted. True, good backgrounds may produce a good effect and lay a good foundation, but who can deny the poison engendered by revisionist elements in the last 17 years, and who can deny that a violent class struggle at our side necessarily reflects itself in our thinking? Therefore, in this great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which is unprecedented in history, it is not at all strange for fellow-students with good backgrounds to commit mistakes in choosing their line. Of course, we must be on our guard against the oppression, attack, and exclusion of such fellow-students with good backgrounds once more by people with ulterior motives by means of the class line of revisionism.

In short, we cannot regard the above-mentioned article as consistent with Mao Tse-tung's thinking. It is doubtless a poison weed, and it is no mere accident or an isolated instance that this article has emerged. Geared to the counter-current against the Central Committee's Cultural Revolution, this article has played the shameful role of an uncalled-for contender. Its appearance shows the survival of the remnants of the bourgeois reactionary line, which is, furthermore, engaged in a counter-blow. We must not relax our vigilance.

Let us gravely warn the handful of people like the author of the article that the way they are acting will not redound to their benefit. Their behavior simply agonizes those who are intimate with them and pleases those who are antagonistic to them.

In the spirit of Chairman Mao's teaching--"Punish first offenders to deter others following in their footsteps, and treat the sick to save others' lives"--let us shout aloud, "Comrades, you have taken the wrong road! Quickly restrain your horse on the brink of the precipice. Return to the side of Chairman Mao. Do not sacrifice yourselves to the bourgeois reactionary line!"

To the handful of rotten eggs who harbor the design to attack the Central Committee's Cultural Revolution, let us say: "Don't you imagine that it would be easy for ants and gnats to fell a tree! When you bombard the Central Committee's Cultural Revolution and the headquarters of the proletariat, you can only thoroughly expose your hideous faces and pick up stones to hit your own feet!"

For those die-hards who cling steadfastly to the bourgeois reactionary line without let-up, Chairman Mao drew this picture long ago: "The reactionary elements of the world may be so today, tomorrow, and day after tomorrow, but they cannot remain so forever. Later they will change...These reactionary elements...will change into a pile of dogs' excrement obnoxious to mankind."

Chairman Mao also said, "Thousands upon thousands of martyrs have before us courageously sacrificed themselves for the interests of the people. Let us hold aloft their flag and step on their blood stains to march forward!" The Red Guards of Chairman Mao may be beheaded or shed blood, but Mao Tse-tung's thinking can never be abandoned.

The editorial of the periodical Hung-ch'i pointed out, "Comrades who have committed mistakes in the first stage must earnestly correct them and keep far away from the bourgeois reactionary line. They must return to the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao."

"If not, and if they continue along the mistaken line, nothing but collapse will befall them."

Resolutely support the correct leadership of the Central Committee's Sub-Committee on the Cultural Revolution!

Thoroughly smash the counterattacks of the bourgeois reactionary line!

6096
CSO: 3577-D