

The CC approved and circulated the Central Propaganda Department's "Self-Criticism Regarding the Errors of the Magazine 'Study'".

Date: April 4, 1952

All departments of the Central Committee and the Central Military Commission; all Party groups of the Central People's Government; all bureaus and sub-bureaus of the Central Committee, and Party committees of all provinces, municipalities, and autonomous regions; Party committees of all major military regions and the Chinese People's Volunteer Army:

(i) The Central Committee considers the Central Propaganda Department's self-criticism of the errors in the magazine "Study" dated March 29 to be necessary and appropriate. The focus here is on self-criticism and correction, and no disciplinary action is proposed.

(II) This self-criticism document from the Central Propaganda Department will be distributed to Party committees at all levels. It is hoped that Party committees at all levels will organize propaganda and cultural workers to discuss it, and that it may be published in Party journals.

The Central Propaganda Department's Self-Criticism Regarding the Errors of the Magazine "Study" (March 29, 1952)

Chairman Mao and the Central Committee:

The article published in the magazine *Study* during the "Three-Anti" Movement, concerning the criticism of bourgeois ideology, contained some fundamental errors. Following the instructions of the Central Committee, we convened two meetings with responsible comrades from various cultural, educational, and propaganda units to discuss this issue. Subsequently, at a propaganda work conference composed of key personnel from the Central Propaganda Department and the Party Group of the State Cultural Commission, a self-criticism regarding this issue was also made. The results of the discussions are reported as follows:

(I) The magazine *Study* published a series of articles with serious errors in its first, second, and third issues of 1952. In the first issue, Yang Er (Xu Liqun)'s article, "Only Marxism-Leninism Can Lead the Transformation of Bourgeois Ideology," described the transformation of bourgeois ideology as using proletarian ideology to "fundamentally negate" bourgeois ideology. In the third issue, Ai Siqi's "Recognizing the Reactionary Nature of Bourgeois Ideology" and Yu Guangyuan's "Clarifying the Understanding of Bourgeois Ideology and Thoroughly Criticizing Bourgeois Ideology" both failed to analyze and dismissed the certain position and role of the national bourgeoisie in the New Democratic Revolution and construction. Furthermore, Wu Jiang's "On the 'Activity' of the Bourgeoisie" in the second issue, which described the bourgeoisie's activity in the New Democratic Revolution as a deceptive tactic, was also erroneous. These articles essentially denied the existence of a dual nature within the national bourgeoisie at the present stage, concluding that it only had a reactionary and corrupt side, thus fundamentally denying the continued activity of the national bourgeoisie at the present stage. This openly violated the Party's line and policies. The comrades who wrote these articles failed to distinguish between the following two things: one is that we must educate and transform our teachers and students in schools and ordinary staff members in state organs (excluding political representatives of the bourgeoisie) with the system of Marxism-Leninism in order to eliminate their bourgeois ideology; the other is that we must use the Common Program to transform the bourgeois ideology that is incompatible with the Common Program, namely the "five poisons" ideology, so that they will no longer engage in the "five poisons" and will instead conduct business rationally and legally under the leadership of the working class. These comrades have

confused these two things into one, that is, they have confused the latter with the former. Moreover, some of these articles have a tendency to require the bourgeoisie to accept the system of Marxism-Leninism as a class and not allow the bourgeoisie to have any of its own ideas. These are unrealistic, inconsistent with Marxist viewpoints, and are naive and ridiculous.

(II) During the "Three-Anti" and "Five-Anti" movements, a "leftist" sentiment arose among some cadres and the masses. The aforementioned articles in the magazine *Study* vividly demonstrate this naive and all-encompassing "leftist" sentiment regarding the bourgeoisie. These comrades' articles failed to conduct a serious and concrete analysis of the issues discussed, based on the policies of the Party Central Committee. Instead, they proceeded purely from their own abstract conjectures, making baseless inferences that completely violated logic and Marxist common sense. Therefore, these articles lacked confidence and, in fact, did not criticize anything, instead placing themselves in a passive position. This style of engaging in empty talk without grasping and analyzing concrete materials or conducting specific research on the issues is a vile manifestation of the remnants of dogmatism within the Party. Dogmatism combined with the "leftist" sentiment of the petty bourgeoisie resulted in the serious errors in these articles that deviated from the Party's line and Marxism.

(III) *Study* magazine is a publication edited by the Theoretical Propaganda Department of the Central Propaganda Department. The continuous publication of articles that violate the Party's line in a publication of the Central Propaganda Department is a serious lesson for us. When *Study* magazine discusses such important issues, it presumptuously states things that the Central Committee has not said, or even contradicts what the Central Committee has said, without consulting or reporting to the Central Committee. This demonstrates an extremely unserious attitude towards the Party's ideological work and is a serious act of disorganization and undiscipline. We request that the Central Committee give me and the comrades responsible in this incident the punishment we deserve.

(iv) Before December of last year, Hu Sheng was in charge of editing *Study* magazine, with Hu Qiaomu reviewing the proofs. This year, Yu Guangyuan and Wang Huide took over the editing responsibilities (Hu Sheng went to participate in the land reform and returned at the end of February after being transferred by the Central Committee). Due to Qiaomu's illness and inability to work, the magazine's publishing system was somewhat chaotic. The three issues published this year were all compiled by Yu Guangyuan and Wang Huide. Xiong Fu reviewed the proofs of the first and second issues, and Hu Sheng reviewed the proofs of the third issue. I also reviewed the proofs of the main articles. All the comrades who submitted manuscripts and reviewed the proofs should bear some responsibility for the error in the magazine *Study*, and they all made self-criticisms at the meeting (the self-criticisms of some comrades were not profound enough and need to continue). During this period, Yu Guangyuan was in charge of the Theoretical Propaganda Department. In February of this year, I instructed Yu Guangyuan to draft an outline for discussion on the issue of criticizing bourgeois ideology, then convene a meeting for discussion to reach a consensus on the points of disagreement, and then submit the discussion results to the Central Committee before writing the article. However, Comrade Guangyuan consistently delayed drafting the outline, thus failing to follow the original steps. After reviewing the proofs of Ai Siqi and Yu Guangyuan's articles, I allowed them to be published, which was wrong both ideologically and in terms of organizational principles.

(V) The systematic, differentiated, and specific work of criticizing bourgeois ideology, in accordance with the Central Committee's guidelines, should continue. This lesson should teach us how to correctly apply Marxism to criticize bourgeois ideology, not to abandon this critical work altogether. Since the "Five-Anti" campaign is still in full swing in some major cities, it is not yet appropriate to

publish self-criticism articles on this issue. Therefore, in accordance with the Chairman's instructions, we plan to publish appropriate self-criticism articles in the *Study* magazine after the "Five-Anti" campaign concludes. We plan to reprint an article by Comrade Feng Ding published in the *Liberation Daily* in the April issue of *Study* magazine. The article's viewpoint is basically correct (we have revised some of its shortcomings). This error has exposed intolerable shortcomings in the editorial strategy and working methods of *Study* magazine. If these are not reformed in time, the harm will be considerable. We plan to conduct a thorough self-examination and make necessary reforms immediately (we plan to suspend publication for one and a half months in April and May for self-examination and reform). In examining this error, we were keenly aware that various departments within the Central Propaganda Department lacked the necessary seriousness and discipline, the necessary Marxist theoretical preparation, and a serious study of the Central Committee's instructions. Furthermore, their daily attention to and study of ideological issues was insufficient, and instances of disorganization and lack of discipline remained numerous. We must learn from this lesson and earnestly rectify our work in order to improve.

Lu Dingyi, Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China,
March 29