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"Talks at the Yan'an Conference on Literature and Art"*

Mao Zedong

* Translator's note: I have retained the original number of sentences from Mao's text. Punctuation within sentences, however, has been changed to conform to standard American usage.
October 19 is the seventh anniversary of the death of Lu Xun. We have specially published Comrade Mao Zedong's talks at the Yan'an conference on literature and art to commemorate the greatest and most heroic standard-bearer of the Chinese cultural revolution.

*People's Daily* editor, 1943

INTRODUCTION*

(2 May 1942)

Comrades! I have invited you to this conference today for the purpose of exchanging opinions with you on the correct relationship between work in literature and art and revolutionary work in general, to obtain the correct development of revolutionary literature and art and better assistance from them in our other revolutionary work, so that we may overthrow our national enemy and accomplish our task of national liberation.²

There are a number of different fronts in our struggle for the national liberation of China, civil and military, or, we might say, there is a cultural as well as an armed front. Victory over the enemy depends primarily on armies with guns in their hands, but this kind of army alone is not enough. We still need a cultural army, since this kind of army is indispensable in achieving unity among ourselves and winning victory over the enemy. Since May Fourth, when this cultural army took shape in China, it has aided the Chinese revolution by gradually limiting the sphere of China's feudal culture and the slavish culture³ that serves imperialist aggression, and weakening their strength, so that now reactionaries are reduced to resisting

---

* Numbers in the text refer to the changes from the 1943/1944 text to the 1953/1956 text, as listed in Appendix 1. All changes (except punctuation) that survive translation are listed there.
new culture by "meeting quality with quantity": reactionaries aren't short of money, and with some effort they can turn out a lot even if they can't come up with anything worthwhile. Literature and art have formed an important and successful part of the cultural front since May Fourth. The revolutionary movement in literature and art, which developed considerably during the Civil War period, had the same general direction as the Red Army struggles of that time, but there was no coordination between them in their actual work and each fought as an independent army. The reason was that the reactionaries at that time kept the two fraternal armies apart. After the War of Resistance against Japan broke out, the number of workers in the field of revolutionary literature and art who came to Yan'an and other anti-Japanese bases increased, which was very good. However, coming to a base area is by no means the same thing as integrating with the people's movement there, and if we want to push ahead with our revolutionary work, we must integrate these two forces completely. Our meeting today is to ensure that literature and art become a component part of the whole revolutionary machinery, so they can act as a powerful weapon in uniting and educating the people while attacking and annihilating the enemy, and help the people achieve solidarity in their struggle against the enemy. What are the problems which must be solved in order to achieve this purpose? They are questions relating to our position, attitude, audience, work, and study.

The question of our position. We identify ourselves with the proletariat and the broad popular masses. Communist Party members must also identify themselves with the Party and with its basic character and policy. Is it true that some of our workers in literature and art still lack a clear and correct understanding of this question? I think so: many comrades have frequently strayed from their correct position.

The question of attitude. The question of the concrete attitude we are to take in regard to various concrete matters arises out of the question of our position. For example, whether to praise or expose something is a question of attitude. Which, ultimately, is the attitude we need to take? I would say that we need both kinds of attitudes; it all depends on whom we are dealing with. There are three kinds of people: our enemies, our friends, and ourselves; that is, the proletariat and its vanguard. A different attitude is required for each of these three kinds of people. Should we "praise" the enemy, Japanese fascists and all other enemies of the people? Certainly not, because they are the very worst kind of reactionaries. They may have some superiority on a technical level, so that we can say, for example, that their guns and artillery are quite good, but good weapons in their hands are reactionary. The task of our armed forces is to capture their weapons and turn them against the enemy to seize victory. The task of our cultural army is to expose the enemy's atrocities, treachery, and inevitable defeat, and to encourage anti-Japanese forces to unite in complete solidarity to win a decisive victory. To our friends, our allies of various kinds, our attitude should include unity and criticism according to the circumstances. We support their resistance to Japan, and we praise any achievements they may make. But we should criticize and oppose anyone who is anti-Communist and anti-people, who goes on taking the road of reaction day after day. As for the popular masses, we should obviously praise their toil and struggle, their army and their party. Shortcomings exist even among the people: many members of the proletariat still retain petty bourgeois ways of thinking, and both peasants and petty bourgeoisie have backward ways of thinking which hamper them in their struggle. We must educate them patiently over a long period of time, helping them to cast off this burden from their backs so that they can advance with rapid strides. They have either reformed themselves or are in the process of reforming themselves in the struggle, and our literature and art should describe this process of their reform, instead of ridiculing them in a very narrow-minded and mistaken way, or even regarding them as some kind of enemy. What we write should help them to unite, to make progress and to struggle forward in complete solidarity, discarding their backward qualities and developing their revolutionary qualities. It certainly should not have the opposite effect.

The question of audience is the question of for whom we are writing. This problem is not the same in the anti-Japanese bases in the Border Area, northern China, and central China as in the general rear or pre-war Shanghai. In the Shanghai period, the audience for revolutionary works of literature and art consisted primarily of students, office workers, and shop assistants. In the general rear after the war broke out, this circle expanded a little, but it still consisted primarily of the same people because the government there has kept workers, peasants, and soldiers away from revolutionary literature and art. It is a completely different matter in our base areas. The audience for works of literature and art here consists of workers, peasants, and soldiers, together with their
cadres in the Party, the government, and the army. There are students in the base areas too, but they are either cadres already or cadres of the future. Once they are literate, cadres of various kinds, soldiers in the army, workers in factories, and peasants in the countryside want books and newspapers, while people who aren't literate want to see plays, look at pictures, sing songs, and listen to music; they are the audience for our works of literature and art. Just to take cadres alone, you shouldn't underestimate their numbers. They outnumber by far the readership for any book published in the general rear, where one edition usually consists of only two thousand copies, and even three editions only amount to six thousand; while cadres in the base areas in Yan'an alone include more than ten thousand who can read. What is more, many of these cadres are mature revolutionaries who have endured many trials; they come from all over China and they will go and work all over China, so that educational work among these people is of immense significance. Our workers in literature and art should work for them very conscientiously.

Since the audience for literature and art consists of workers, peasants, soldiers, and their cadres, the question then arises of how to get to understand and know these people properly. To do this, we must carry out a great deal of work in Party and government organs, in villages and factories, in the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army, getting to understand all sorts of situations and all sorts of people and making ourselves thoroughly familiar with them. Our workers in literature and art must carry out their own work in literature and art, but the task of understanding people and getting to know them properly has the highest priority. How have our workers in literature and art performed in this respect until now? I would say that until now they have been heroes without a battlefield, remote and uncomprehending. What do I mean by remote? Remote from people. Workers in literature and art are unfamiliar with the people they write about and with the people who read their work, or else have actually become estranged from them. Our workers in literature and art are not familiar with workers, peasants, soldiers, or even their cadres. What do I mean by uncomprehending? Not comprehending their language. Yours is the language of intellectuals, theirs is the language of the popular masses. I have mentioned before that many comrades like to talk about "popularization," but what does popularization mean? It means that the thoughts and emotions of our workers in literature and art should become one with the thoughts and emotions of the great masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers. And to get this unity, we should start by studying the language of the masses. If we don't even understand the masses' language, how can we talk about creating literature and art? "Heroes without a battlefield" refers to the fact that all your fine principles are not appreciated by the masses. The more you parade your qualifications before the masses, the more you act like "heroes," and the harder you try to sell your principles to them, the more the masses will resist buying. If you want the masses to understand you, if you want to become one with the masses, you must make a firm decision to undergo a long and possibly painful process of trial and hardship. At this point let me relate my own experience in how feelings are transformed. "Heroes without a battlefield" refers to the fact that all your fine principles are not appreciated by the masses. The more you parade your qualifications before the masses, the more you act like "heroes," and the harder you try to sell your principles to them, the more the masses will resist buying. If you want the masses to understand you, if you want to become one with the masses, you must make a firm decision to undergo a long and possibly painful process of trial and hardship. At this point let me relate my own experience in how feelings are transformed. I started off as a student at school, and at school I acquired student habits, so that I felt ashamed to do any manual labor such as carry my own bags in front of all those students who were incapable of carrying anything for themselves. I felt that intellectuals were the only clean people in the world, and that workers, peasants, and soldiers were in general rather dirty. I could wear clothes borrowed from an intellectual, because I considered them clean, but I would not wear workers', peasants', or soldiers' clothes, because I thought they were dirty. When I joined the revolution and lived among workers, peasants, and soldiers, I gradually became familiar with them and they got to know me in return. Then and only then the bourgeois and petty bourgeois feelings taught me in bourgeois schools began to undergo a fundamental change. Comparing intellectuals who have not yet reformed with workers, peasants, and soldiers, I came to feel that intellectuals are not only spiritually unclean in many respects but even physically unclean, while the cleanest people are workers and peasants; their hands may be dirty and their feet soiled with cow dung, but they are still cleaner than the big and petty bourgeoisie. This is what I call a transformation in feelings, changing over from one class to another. If our workers in literature and art who come from the intelligentsia want their work to be welcomed by the masses, they must see to it that their thoughts and feelings undergo transformation and reform. Otherwise, nothing they do will turn out well or be effective.

The final question is study, by which I mean the study of Marxism-Leninism and the study of society. Anyone who calls himself a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary writer, particularly a Party writer, must have a general knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, but at the present time, some comrades still lack fundamental Marxist-
Leninist ideas. For example, one fundamental idea in Marxism-Leninism is that the objective determines the subjective; that is, the objective reality of class struggle and national struggle determines our thoughts and feelings. However, some of our comrades turn this problem upside down: they say that everything should proceed from "love." Now love, in a class society, only exists as class love, but these comrades want to seek after some kind of love which goes beyond class, or love in the abstract; also abstract freedom, abstract truth, abstract human nature, and so on. This shows how deeply these comrades have been influenced by the bourgeoisie. They must eliminate this influence thoroughly and study Marxism-Leninism with an open mind free from prejudice. It is right that workers in literature and art should study literary and artistic creation, but Marxism-Leninism is a science that all revolutionaries must study, and workers in literature and art are no exception. In addition, you must study society, that is, you must undertake research on the various social classes, their mutual relations and individual circumstances, their outward features and their psychology. Only when these things have been clearly perceived can our literature and art become rich in content and take a correct direction.

Today I have only mentioned these things by way of an introduction; I hope that you will offer your opinions on these and other relevant questions.

CONCLUSION

(23 May 1942)

Comrades! Our conference has met three times this month, and in our search for truth several dozen party and non-party comrades have spoken, producing heated debates, bringing problems into the open and making them concrete; I believe that this will prove beneficial to the whole movement in literature and art.

When we discuss any problem we should start with facts rather than definitions. Looking up definitions of what constitutes literature or art in textbooks to use for setting goals for today's movement in literature and art, or for judging various opinions and controversies arising today, is the wrong approach. We are Marxists, and Marxism tells us that in dealing with problems we should not start from abstract definitions but from objective facts, and that we should derive our goals, policy, and methods from an analysis of these facts. The same applies to our present discussion of the movement in literature and art.

What are the facts at the present time? The facts are: the War of Resistance which China has been waging for five years; the world war against fascism; the indecisiveness of the Chinese big landlord class and big bourgeoisie in the War of Resistance and their oppressive policies internally; the revolutionary movement in literature and art since May Fourth—its great contribution to the revolution over the last twenty-three years and its many shortcomings; the anti-Japanese democratic base areas of the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and the integration of large numbers of workers in literature and art with these armies; the difference in circumstances and responsibilities between workers in literature and art in the base areas and those in the general rear; the controversies and problems that have already arisen concerning work in literature and art in Yan'an and other anti-Japanese bases at the present time—these are actual and undeniable facts, and we must consider our problems on the basis of these facts.

Well, then, what is the central issue facing us? In my opinion, our problem is fundamentally one of serving the masses and how to do this. If we do not solve this problem, or if we do not solve it properly, then our workers in literature and art will not be attuned to their circumstances and responsibilities and will come up against a string of problems both internal and external. My conclusion will consist of some further explanation with this problem as the central issue and will also touch on a few other problems related to it.

1.

The first question is: who are the people our literature and art are for? It may seem to comrades engaged in work in literature and art in our various anti-Japanese base areas that this problem has already been solved and does not require further mention. This is in fact not the case, since many comrades have certainly not found a clear and definite answer to this question. Therefore, in their emotions, works, actions, and views on the question of the goal of literature and art, to some extent a situation inevitably arises that is neither appropriate to the needs of the masses or the actual
struggle. Of course, although among the large number of cultural people, writers, artists, and workers in the field of literature and art in general who are now engaged in the great struggle for liberation along with the Communist Party, the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army, there may be opportunists who will remain only temporarily, or even spies sent by the enemy or the Special Branch of the Nationalist Party masquerading as writers and artists, nevertheless, apart from such people, the rest work energetically for the common cause, and thanks to these comrades, great achievements have been made in all of our work in literature, drama, music, and art. Many of these workers in literature and art began to be involved in this work after the War of Resistance broke out, but many others were engaged in revolutionary work for a long time even before the war; they have undergone many hardships and have also influenced the broad masses both in their ordinary work and in the creative work. But why do we still say that even among these comrades there are some who have not clearly and definitely solved the question of who are the people our literature and art are for? Is it possible that they still maintain that literature and art are not for the popular masses but for exploiters and oppressors?

There is indeed such a thing as literature and art that serves exploiters and oppressors. The literature and art that serve the landlord class are feudal literature and art, that is, the literature and art of the ruling class in China during the feudal era. This kind of literature and art still has considerable influence to this day. The literature and art that serve the bourgeoisie are bourgeois literature and art; although people like Liang Shiqiu, who was criticized by Lu Xun, talk about some kind of literature and art that transcends class, in practice they uphold bourgeois literature and art and oppose proletarian literature and art. The literature and art that serve imperialism, represented by people like Zhou Xuren and Zhang Ziping, is called slave culture or slave literature and art. There is also another kind of literature and art, which serves the Special Branch and may be called "Special" literature and art: it may be "revolutionary" on the surface, but in reality it belongs with the three categories above. For us, literature and art are not for those groups mentioned above but for the people. As we have said before, the new culture of China at its present stage is an antiimperialist, antifeudal culture of the popular masses under the leadership of the proletariat. Whatever genuinely belongs to the masses must be under the leadership of the popular masses. New literature and art, which are part of new culture, are naturally in the same category.

We do not by any means refuse to use the old forms of the feudal class and the bourgeoisie, but in our hands these old forms are reconstructed and filled with new content, so that they also become revolutionary and serve the people.

Well, then, who are the popular masses? The broadest section of the people, who constitute more than ninety percent of the total population, are workers, peasants, soldiers, and the petty bourgeoisie. Therefore, our literature and art are in the first place for the workers, the class that leads the revolution. Secondly, they are for the peasants, the broadest and firmest allies in the revolution. Thirdly, they are for workers and peasants who have taken up arms, namely the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army, and other popular armed forces; these are the chief strength in war. Fourthly, they are for the petty bourgeoisie, who are also allies in the revolution and can cooperate with us on a long-term basis. These four kinds of people constitute the largest sector of the Chinese nation and the broadest popular masses. We should also make alliances with anti-Japanese elements in the landlord class and bourgeoisie, but they do not support democracy among the broad popular masses. They have a literature and art of their own, while our literature and art are not for them and are in any case rejected by them.

Our literature and art should be for the four kinds of people mentioned above. Workers, peasants, and soldiers are again the most important element in these four groups; the petty bourgeoisie are fewer in number, their revolutionary determination is weaker, and they have a higher cultural level than workers, peasants, and soldiers. Our literature and art are therefore primarily for workers, peasants, and soldiers, and only secondarily for the petty bourgeoisie. Here, we must not raise the petty bourgeoisie to a primary position and relegate workers, peasants, and soldiers to a secondary position. The problem we now have with one group of comrades, or the key to their inability to solve correctly the problem of who are the people our literature and art are for, is just this. I am not now talking about theory. On a theoretical level, that is, in what they say, not a single person in our ranks would regard workers, peasants, and soldiers as less important than the petty bourgeoisie. I am talking about practice, or what they do: do they still regard members of the petty bourgeoisie as more important than workers, peasants, and soldiers? I think they do. Many comrades place more emphasis on studying the intelligentsia and analyzing their psychology; their main concern is to show their side of things, excusing and even defending their shortcomings, instead of guiding the intelligentsia from petty bourgeois backgrounds and themselves as well towards closer contact with workers, peasants, and soldiers.
to take part in their actual struggles, to show how things are with them and educate them. Coming from a petty bourgeoisie background and being themselves intellectuals, many comrades only look for friends among the ranks of the intelligentsia and focus their attention on studying and describing them. This would be quite proper if they did so from a proletarian position. But that is not the case at all, or only partly so. They identify themselves with the petty bourgeoisie and their creative work is designed to act as a means of self-expression for the petty bourgeoisie; we have seen this sort of thing in a fairly large number of works of literature and art. Many times they express heartfelt sympathy for the intelligentsia from petty bourgeoisie backgrounds, and even the shortcomings of the petty bourgeoisie win their sympathy or actual encouragement. But when it comes to workers, peasants, and soldiers, these people don't have any contact with them, don't understand them, don't study them, don't have close friends among them, and are no good at describing them. They can dress their characters up as workers, peasants, and soldiers, but these characters still have petty bourgeoisie faces. They do like some things about workers, peasants, soldiers, and cadres from worker–peasant–soldier backgrounds, but they don't like them all the time or everything about them: they don't like their emotions, their manner, or their budding literature and art (wall newspapers, murals, folk songs, folk tales, popular speech, and so on). Sometimes they even like these things, too, either out of curiosity or because they want to decorate their own work with them, or even to look for backward things about them. At other times they openly despise these things in their infatuation with the works of the intelligentsia, the petty bourgeoisie, or even the bourgeoisie itself. These comrades still have their areas of the side of the petty bourgeoisie, or to put it more elegantly, their innermost souls are still in the kingdom of the petty bourgeoisie. This is why they haven't yet solved the problem of what sort of people to serve, or haven't solved it clearly and definitely. I'm not simply talking about people who haven't been in Yan'an for long; even people who have been to the front and who have carried out work in the base areas, the Eighth Route Army, or the New Fourth Army for several years, still haven't arrived at a thoroughgoing solution. It may take as long as eight to ten years before this problem can be settled once and for all. But no matter how long it takes, it must be settled, and settled clearly, definitely, and thoroughly. Our workers in literature and art must fulfill this responsibility and shift their arses; they must gradually move over to the side of the workers, peasants, and soldiers by entering deeply into their ranks and the actual struggle, and studying Marxism–Leninism and society; this is the only way we can have literature and art that genuinely serve workers, peasants, and soldiers.

The question of what sort of people we serve is a fundamental question, a question of principle. The controversies, disagreements, opposition, and disunity that have existed among comrades in the past have not been concerned with this fundamental question of principle, but with rather secondary questions that may not involve principles at all. But when it came to this question of principle, however, there was no real disagreement but almost unanimity on both sides, since both to some extent had a tendency to despise workers, peasants, and soldiers and to isolate themselves from the masses; I say to some extent, because generally speaking, the way in which these comrades despised workers, peasants, and soldiers and isolated themselves from the masses differs in some respects from the behavior of the Nationalist Party; but nevertheless, this tendency does exist, and unless the fundamental question is settled, it won't be easy to settle many other questions either. Take sectarianism in the literary and art world, for instance, which is also a question of principle; the only way to get rid of sectarianism is by raising the slogan, "Serve the workers and peasants, serve the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies, and go among the masses," and actually carrying it out in practice; otherwise, the problem of sectarianism will never be solved. Lu Xun has said that disunity on the front of revolutionary literature and art is caused by lack of a common purpose, and that this common purpose is to serve the workers and peasants. The same problem existed then in Shanghai, and now it also exists in Chongqing; it is very difficult to solve it thoroughly in such places because people there oppress revolutionary writers and artists and do not allow them freedom to go among the masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers. Conditions here with us are completely different: we encourage revolutionary writers and artists to develop positive contacts with workers, peasants, and soldiers, we give them complete freedom to go among the masses, and we give them complete freedom to create genuinely revolutionary literature and art; we have therefore come close to solving the problem here. But coming close to solving a problem isn't the same as solving it completely and thoroughly; our insistence on studying Marxism–Leninism and society is just for this purpose, a complete and thorough-going solution. What we mean by Marxism–Leninism is a living Marxism–Leninism, which is fully applicable in the life and struggles of the masses, and not a Marxism–Leninism which only comes from books. If we move this Marxism–Leninism out of books and into the masses so that it becomes a living
Marxism-Leninism sectarianism will be impossible, and many other problems apart from sectarianism can be solved.

2.

Once the question of what kind of people we serve has been solved, the next problem is how to go about it. In your own words, should we put our efforts into raising standards or into reaching a wider audience?

A few comrades, some more seriously than others, have in the past despised or ignored the work of reaching a wider audience and have exaggerated out of all proportion the work of raising standards. Raising standards should be stressed, but it is wrong to exaggerate it out of all proportion. The lack of a clear and definite solution to the question of what sort of people we serve, which I spoke of above, is also evident in this question. Since there is no clear understanding of what people to serve, there aren't any correct criteria for their discussions on reaching wider audiences or raising standards, while the correct relationship between the two is of course even more difficult to find. Since our literature and art are fundamentally for workers, peasants, and soldiers, reaching a wider audience means reaching a wider audience among them, and raising standards means raising standards among them. What are we trying to reach them with? Feudal things? Bourgeois things? Petty bourgeois things? None of these will do: we must use what belongs to workers, peasants, and soldiers, and therefore, the task of learning from workers, peasants, and soldiers comes before the task of educating them. This is even more true of raising standards. There must be a basis from which standards are raised; for example, a bucket of water is raised from the ground, it can hardly be raised from midair. Well, then, where do we start off from? From a feudal basis? From a bourgeois basis? From a petty bourgeois basis? None of these will do: we must raise standards on the basis of workers, peasants, and soldiers, on the basis of their present cultural level and their budding literature and art. Instead of raising workers, peasants, and soldiers to feudal, bourgeois, or petty bourgeois heights, we raise their standards in the direction of their own development. Here, too, the task of learning from workers, peasants, and soldiers arises. Only by starting from workers, peasants, and soldiers can we gain a correct understanding of what it means to reach a wider audience and to raise standards, and find the correct relationship between them.

Reaching a wider audience and raising standards are both worthy activities, but from what source do they arise? Works of literature and art, as conceptualized forms on whatever level of operation, are the result of the human mind reflecting and processing popular life; revolutionary literature and art are thus the result of the revolutionary's mind reflecting and processing popular life. Rich deposits of literature and art actually exist in popular life itself: they are things in their natural form, crude but also extremely lively, rich, and fundamental; they make all processed forms of literature pale in comparison, they are the sole and inexhaustible source of processed forms of literature and art. They are the sole source, because only this kind of source can exist; no other exists apart from it. Someone may ask whether works of literature and art in book form, classical or foreign works, aren't also a source. Well, you can say they are a source, but a secondary and not a primary one; it would be a distorted way of looking at things to regard them as primary. In fact, books and other works already in existence are not the source but the flow, they are things that the ancients and foreigners processed and fabricated from the literature and art they perceived in popular life in their own time and place. We must absorb these things in a discriminating way, using them as models from which we may learn what to accept or what to reject when we process works of literature and art as conceptualized forms from the literature and art in popular life in our own time and place. It makes a difference to have this model, the difference between being civilized or vulgar, crude or refined, advanced or elementary, fast or slow; therefore, we certainly may not reject the ancients and foreigners as models, which means, I'm afraid, that we must even use feudal and bourgeois things. But they are only models and not substitutes; they can't be substitutes. Indiscriminate plagiarization, imitation, or substitution in literature and art of dead people or foreigners is an extremely sterile and harmful literary and artistic dogmatism, of the same basic nature as dogmatism in military, political, philosophical, or economic matters. Revolutionary Chinese writers and artists, the kind from whom we expect great things, must go among the masses; they must go among the masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers and into the heat of battle for a long time to come, without reservation, devoting body and soul.
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to the task ahead; they must go to the sole, the broadest, and the richest source, to observe, experience, study, and analyze all the different kinds of people, all the classes and all the masses, all the vivid patterns of life and struggle, and all literature and art in their natural form, before they are ready for the stage of processing or creating, where you integrate raw materials with production, the stage of study with the stage of creation. Otherwise, there won’t be anything for you to work on, since without raw materials or semi-processed goods you have nothing to process and will inevitably end up as the kind of useless writer or artist that Lu Xun in his will earnestly instructed his son never to become.

Although literature and art in their natural form are the sole source of literature and art in conceptualized form, and although the former is incomparably more vivid and interesting, nevertheless, people are still not satisfied with the former and demand the latter; why is this? It is because while both are beautiful, literature and art that have been processed are more organized and concentrated than literature and art in their natural form; they are more typical and more idealized, and therefore have greater universality. The living Lenin was infinitely more vigorous and interesting than the Lenin of fiction, drama, and film, but the living Lenin did so many things in the course of a single day, and so much of what he did was identical with other people’s work; besides, very few people ever saw Lenin, and after his death no one could ever see him again. In these respects the Lenin of fiction, drama, and film is superior to the living Lenin. Revolutionary fiction, drama, film, and so on can create all sorts of characters on the basis of real life and help the masses push history forward. For example, some people suffer from hunger and oppression while others exploit and oppress them: this state of affairs exists everywhere and no one gets upset about it; but literature and art organize and concentrate this kind of everyday occurrence, making it typical and creating a work of literature and art which can awaken and arouse the popular masses, urging them on to unity and struggle and to take part in transforming their own environment. If there were no processed literature and art, but only literature and art in their natural form, it would be impossible to accomplish this task or at least to do it as powerfully and speedily.

Literature and art for a wide audience and literature and art to raise standards are both processed forms, so what is the difference between them? There is a difference of degree.

Literature and art for a wide audience indicates that the processing has been relatively limited and crude, and therefore relatively easy for the broad popular masses at the present time to accept readily, while literature and art to raise standards indicates that the processing has been relatively extensive and skillful, and hence, relatively difficult for them. The problem which now faces workers, peasants, and soldiers is that they are engaged in a bitter struggle with the enemy and yet they are illiterate, ignorant, and uncultured as a result of prolonged feudal and bourgeois rule; their most urgent demand, therefore, is for a wide-reaching educational movement in the form of cultural knowledge and works of literature and art that they urgently need and can readily accept, which will heighten their ardor in the struggle and faith in victory, strengthen their unity, and make them struggle against the enemy in full solidarity. The first step for them is not a question of "pinning flowers on brocade" but "sending charcoal in the snow." The most serious and central task in regard to the people, therefore, is initially the work of reaching a wider audience rather than raising standards. The attitude of despising or ignoring the work of reaching a wider audience is a mistaken one.

There is, however, no hard and fast line between the work of reaching a wide audience and raising standards. If the people providing the material for wider audiences aren’t on a higher level than their audience, then what is the point of trying to reach them at all? If their material stays constantly on the same level month after month and year after year, invariably consisting of the same old stock-in-trade like "The Little Cowherd" or "man, hand, mouth, knife, cow, sheep," then what is there to choose between the people who prepare the material and the audience they are reaching? Wouldn’t it be pointless to reach a wider audience in this way? The people demand material that can reach a wide audience, but they also demand higher standards, standards that continue to rise month by month and year by year. Here, raising standards, like reaching a wider audience, is a popular concern; it does not take place in thin air or behind closed doors, but on the basis of reaching to a wider audience; it is determined by the needs of a wider audience and at the same time it acts as a guide to reaching a wider audience. In the case of China, the development of revolution and revolutionary culture has been uneven and their expansion gradual, so that in some places wider audiences have been reached and standards have been raised on that basis, while elsewhere we have not even begun to reach a wider audience; the
experience gained in one area from reaching a wider audience and raising standards can therefore be applied in other areas, giving guidance to this kind of work to keep it on the right track there. In the international sphere, the experience of foreign countries, especially of the Soviet Union, can be used to guide our work of reaching a wider audience and raising standards, provided that their experience is good. In raising standards, therefore, we proceed on the basis of reaching a wider audience; in reaching a wider audience we proceed under the guidance of raising standards. But the material used in raising standards for guidance never involves crude imitation, since this would only destroy its usefulness.

In addition to the direct need on the part of the masses for higher standards, they have also an indirect need, that is, the cadres' need for higher standards. Cadres are the advanced element among the masses, who have generally already completed the kind of education currently offered to the masses; their ability to absorb things is higher than the masses, so that material intended for wider audiences among the masses at their present level, such as "The Little Cowherd," cannot satisfy them. Literature and art on a higher level are absolutely essential for them. But for the time being this kind of need is confined to cadres and not generally felt among the masses; it should be our goal to meet this need, but it should not become the total or the central goal today. At the same time we should understand that in serving cadres we are still wholly concerned with serving the masses, since we rely on cadres to educate and guide the masses. If we violate this aim and give cadres material that can't help them educate and guide the masses, there would be no point in our trying to raise standards, and we would be departing from our fundamental principle of serving the popular masses.

To sum up, the raw material of literature and art in popular life undergoes processing by revolutionary writers to become literature and art in conceptual form, which serve the popular masses; they include both an advanced mass literature and art developed on the basis of lower-grade mass literature and art and serving the needs of the masses whose standards have been raised, primarily mass cadres, as well as a lower-grade mass literature and art, which in their turn come under the guidance of advanced mass literature and art and serve the primary needs of the broad masses today (which isn't to say literature and art with low standards of taste). Whether at a high level or a low one, our literature and art serve the popular masses, primarily workers, peasants, and soldiers; they are created for workers, peasants, and soldiers and are used by them.

Now we have settled the question of the relationship between raising standards and reaching a wider audience, the question of the relationship between professional experts and comrades who carry out the work of reaching wide audiences can also be settled. Our professionals should serve not only cadres but more importantly the masses as well. Gorky was active in editing factory histories, guiding village correspondents, and guiding young people in their teens, while Lu Xun also spent a great deal of time on general correspondence with students. Our professional writers should give their attention to the masses' wall newspapers and to reportage and literature in the army and the villages. Our professional playwrights should give their attention to little theater groups in the army and villages. Our professional musicians should give their attention to songs sung by the masses. Our professional artists should give their attention to mass art. All of these comrades should develop close relationships with comrades who are doing the work of reaching wider audiences on the lowest level among the masses, helping and guiding them at the same time as learning from them and drawing sustenance from them, replenishing, enriching, and nourishing themselves so that their profession does not become an ivory tower isolated from the masses and from reality, devoid of meaning and vitality. We should respect professionals, who are very valuable to us in our cause. But we should tell them that their work as revolutionary writers and artists can only have significance if they ally themselves with the masses, express their point of view, and become their loyal spokesmen. The only way to educate the masses is by being their student. If professional writers and artists regard themselves as masters of the masses, as aristocrats on a superior level to "the lower classes," then no matter how talented they might be, they are completely useless as far as the masses are concerned and there is no future for their work.

Is this attitude of ours utilitarian? Materialists do not oppose utilitarianism in general, but they do oppose feudal, bourgeois, or petty bourgeois utilitarianism, not to mention the kind of hypocrite who opposes utilitarianism in words but practices the most selfish and short-sighted kind of utilitarianism. There is no such thing as super-utilitarianism in this world; in a class society, utilitarianism is a property of class. We are proletarian, revolutionary utilitarians, who take as our starting point a combination of the present and
future interests of the broad masses who constitute over ninety percent of the total population; we are therefore revolutionary utilitarians who adopt an extremely broad and long-range target, rather than guilford utilitarians who are only concerned with the partial and the immediate. For instance, if someone tries to foist on the market and propagate among the masses a work that appeals only to himself and his friends or a small group of people, but which the majority does not need and which may even be harmful to it, all for the sake of promoting his own interests or those of a narrow group, and yet still finds fault with utilitarianism among the masses, then not only he is insulting the masses but also showing a total lack of self-knowledge. Nothing can be considered good unless a large number of people benefit greatly from it. Suppose you have something like "Snow in Spring" which aristocrats enjoy while the masses are still singing "The Sichuanese in the Countryside"; if all you can be bothered to do is curse the masses without trying to raise their standards, then all your curses are useless. The problem at the present time is to combine "Snow in Spring" with "The Sichuanese in the Countryside," which is a problem of combining higher standards with wider audiences. If we don't combine them, professional literature and art of even the highest quality will inevitably turn into the narrowest utilitarianism; you may say it is pure and lofty, but that's only your judgment, the masses won't accept it. Once we have settled the problem of serving the masses and how to go about it as our fundamental goal, we have in so doing settled all the other questions such as position, attitude, audience, material, the description of dark and bright sides, alliance versus opposition, utilitarianism versus super-utilitarianism and narrow utilitarianism versus long-range utilitarianism. If we agree on the fundamental goal, then our workers in literature and art, our schools for literature and art, our publications, organizations, and activities of every kind in literature and art should serve this goal. It would be a mistake to depart from this goal, and anything at variance with it must be revised accordingly.

3.

Since our literature and art are for the popular masses, we can now discuss two further questions, the first concerning the relationships within the party, i.e., the relation between party work in literature and art and party work as a whole, the other concerning relationships that go outside the party, i.e., the relation between party and nonparty work in literature and art—the question of the united front in literature and art.

Let us start with the first question. In the world today, all culture or literature and art belongs to a definite class and party, and has a definite political line. Art for art's sake, art that stands above class and party, and fellow-travelling or politically independent art do not exist in reality. In a society composed of classes and parties, art obeys both class and party and it must naturally obey the political demands of its class and party, and the revolutionary task of a given revolutionary age; any deviation is a deviation from the masses' basic need. Proletarian literature and art are a part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; as Lenin said, they are "a screw in the whole machine," and therefore, the party's work in literature and art occupies a definite, assigned position within the party's revolutionary work as a whole. Opposition to this assignment must lead to dualism or pluralism, and in essence resembles Trotsky's "Politics—Marxist; art—bourgeois." We do not support excessive emphasis on the importance of literature and art, nor do we support their underestimation. Literature and art are subordinate to politics, and yet in turn exert enormous influence on it. Revolutionary literature and art are a part of the whole work of revolution; they are a screw, which of course doesn't compare with other parts in importance, urgency, or priority, but which is nevertheless indispensable in the whole machinery, an indispensable part of revolutionary work as a whole. If literature and art did not exist in even the broadest and most general sense, the revolution could not advance or win victory; it would be incorrect to acknowledge this. Furthermore, when we speak of literature and art obeying politics, politics refers to class and mass politics and not to the small number of people known as politicians. Politics, both revolutionary and counterrevolutionary alike, concerns the struggle between classes and not the behavior of a small number of people. Ideological warfare and literary and artistic warfare, especially if these wars are revolutionary, are necessarily subversive to political warfare, because class and mass needs can only be expressed in a concentrated form through politics. Revolutionary politicians, professional politicians who understand the science or art of revolutionary politics, are simply the leaders of millions of mass politicians; their task is to collect the opinions of mass politicians, distill them, and return them to the masses in an acceptable and practical form; they are not like the kind of aristocratic or armchair "politician" who
acts as if he had a monopoly on brilliance—this is the difference in principle between politicians of the proletariat and the property classes, a difference that also exists between their respective politics. It would be incorrect not to acknowledge this or to see proletarian politics and politicians in a narrow or conventional way.

The second topic is the question of the united front in literature and art. Literature and art are subordinate to politics, and the first and fundamental problem in China today is resistance to Japan; therefore, party workers in literature and art should form an alliance on this issue with writers and artists outside the party (from party sympathizers and petty bourgeois writers and artists to bourgeois and landlord writers and artists). Next, they should form an alliance around the issue of democracy; some writers and artists do not support this issue, so the extent of the alliance here will inevitably be somewhat smaller. Thirdly, they should form an alliance around specific questions among writers and artists—issues of artistic style. We advocate proletarian realism, which again some people do not support, and the extent of the alliance here will probably even be smaller. There may be unity on one question at the same time as there is struggle or criticism on another. Each question is both separate from and connected with the others, so that struggle and criticism continue to exist even on questions where an alliance has been formed, such as resistance to Japan. United front errors, such as alliance without struggle or struggle without alliance, or practicing as some comrades have done in the past either rightist capitulationism and tellism or "leftist" isolationism and sectarianism, all come under the heading of what Lenin called a hamstrung policy. This is just as true in art as it is in politics.

Petty bourgeois writers and artists are an important force in China among the various forces constituting the united front in literature and art. There are many shortcomings in their thinking and their works, but they show some tendency towards revolution and are fairly close to workers, peasants, and soldiers. It is therefore a particularly important task to help them overcome their shortcomings and win them over to the front that serves the masses of workers, peasants, and soldiers.

4.

One of the chief methods of struggle among writers and artists is literary or art criticism. We should develop criticism in literature and art: our past work has been deficient in this regard, as our comrades have correctly pointed out. Literary criticism is a complex problem that requires a great deal of specialized study. Here I shall only discuss the fundamental question of the criteria to be used, along with a brief outline of my opinions on a number of miscellaneous questions and incorrect views raised by some comrades.

There are two criteria in literary criticism, the political and the artistic. According to the political criterion, everything that is in the interests of unity in the War of Resistance, encourages solidarity among the masses, opposes retreat and promotes progress is good or better, while everything that is not in the interests of unity in the War of Resistance, encourages a lack of solidarity among the masses, opposes progress or drags people backwards is bad or worse. Do the words good and bad in this context refer to motive (subjective desires) or to effect (social practice)? Idealists stress motive and deny effect, while mechanical materialists stress effect and deny motive; as dialectical materialists who believe in the unity of motive and effect, we are opposed to both of these approaches. Motives to serve the masses, and effects that win the approval of the masses, cannot be taken separately; the two must be unified. Motives that serve the interests of narrow groups or individuals are no good, but neither are effects that don't win the approval of the masses or aren't in their interests despite a motive to serve them. In examining a writer's subjective desires, whether his motives are correct and upright, we don't go by his declarations but rather by the effect that his actions (his works) produce among the masses in society. The criterion for examining subjective desires is social practice; the criterion for examining motives is their effect. We don't want sectarianism in our literary criticism or art criticism; according to the general principle of alliance in the War of Resistance, we should tolerate works of literature and art that contain different kinds of political attitudes, but our criticism still takes a firm stand on principle, and we must pass strict judgment on works of literature and art that contain antinational, antiscientific, antimasculine, and antiparty views, because these kinds of so-called literature and art, both in motive and effect, damage unity in the War of Resistance. According to the artistic criterion, all works of higher artistic standards are good or better, while those of lower artistic standards are bad or worse; but even in making
"Humanism" is indeed a thing as human nature. If so, a thing is a class, human nature only exists in the concrete, does not exist as a class. "Humanism" is the abstract human nature, the human nature of their own class, without the abstract, human nature, the human nature of their own class, what human nature is. We cannot understand the human nature of their own class, only understand the human nature of their own class.

The fundamental starting point of literature and art is love, the love of human beings. Love is not a product of objective value, but a product of subjective value. The love of human beings is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings. Love is the love of human beings.

"Works of literature and art have always been given equal weight, on a thirty-fifty basis."

"There are a lot of models, and there is certainly not a single one that is more accurate than the others."

the case that works of literature and art always used to be like this. Many petty bourgeois writers have never found the brightness, and their works only expose darkness, under the name of "exposure literature"; some actually specialize in spreading pessimism and cynicism. Soviet Russian literature, on the other hand, in a period of socialist reconstruction, concentrates on descriptions of brightness; it also describes shortcomings in work, but these shortcomings only form a contrast to the overall picture of brightness; there is certainly no question of a "fifty-fifty basis." Bourgeois writers and artists in their reactionary phase describe the revolutionary masses as hooligans and themselves as saints, which can be called reversing brightness and darkness. Only genuinely revolutionary writers and artists can settle correctly the problem of praise and exposure. They must expose every dark force that endangers the popular masses, and praise every revolutionary struggle of the popular masses: this is their fundamental task.

"The task of literature and art has always been exposure." Explanations like this one and the one above show a lack of understanding of the science of history and historical materialism. I have already explained above that literature and art have by no means always been confined to exposure. The only targets that revolutionary writers and artists can take for exposure are aggressors, exploiters, and oppressors, not the popular masses. There are shortcomings among the popular masses too, but these are chiefly a result of the rule exercised over them by aggressors, exploiters, and oppressors, so that our revolutionary writers and artists should expose them as evils for which aggressors, exploiters, and oppressors are responsible, but there shouldn't be any kind of "exposing the people" as such. Our attitude towards the people is only a question of educating them and raising standards among them. No one but counterrevolutionary writers and artists describe the people as "born stupid" and the revolutionary masses as "tyrannical hooligans."

"It is still the age of essays, and we still need the Lu Xun style." If we take the essay and the Lu Xun style just to mean satire, then this view is only correct when it applies to enemies of the people. Lu Xun lived under the rule of the forces of darkness, where there was no freedom of speech, and it was therefore absolutely correct of Lu Xun to use the essay form, with its cold ridicule and burning satire, to do battle. We also have a need for sharp ridicule to direct at fascism and Chinese reactionaries.

but in anti-Japanese bases in the Shaanxi-Gansu-Ningxia Border Areas and elsewhere behind the enemy lines, where revolutionary writers and artists are given complete democratic freedom and only counterrevolutionary and Special Branch elements are denied it, the essay should not take the same form as Lu Xun's; it can shout at the top of its voice, but it shouldn't be obscure or devious, something that the popular masses can't understand. When it came to the people themselves and not their enemies, Lu Xun even in his "essay period" never ridiculed or attacked revolutionary people or parties, and his style in these essays was completely different from the style he employed against the enemy. I have already said above that the people's shortcomings must be criticized, but we must speak from genuine identification with the people and total devotion to their protection and education. If we treat comrades with the ruthless method required against the enemy, then we are identifying ourselves with the enemy. Should we get rid of satire? There are several kinds of satire, for use against the enemy, friends, or our own ranks; each of these three attitudes is different. We certainly won't get rid of satire in general, but we must get rid of its indiscriminate use.

"I am not in the habit of celebrating success or praising virtue; works that praise brightness are not necessarily great, nor are works that portray darkness necessarily trivial." If you are bourgeois writers and artists, you praise the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat, and if you are proletarian writers and artists, then you praise the proletariat and the laboring people, but not the bourgeoisie: each takes its own side. Works that praise the bright side of the bourgeoisie are not necessarily great, and works that portray its dark side are not necessarily trivial; whereas works that praise the bright side of the proletariat are not necessarily less than great, but works that portray its "darkness" are definitely trivial: isn't this a fact of literary and art history? What is wrong with praising the people, the creators of this world and of history? What is wrong with praising the proletariat, the Communist Party, new democracy, and socialism? A type of person does actually exist who has no enthusiasm at all for the popular cause and maintains a cold, detached attitude toward the struggle and victory of the people and their vanguard; the only thing he is interested in and never tires of praising is his own self and perhaps his sweetheart as well, plus a few celebrities from his own clique. This kind of petty bourgeois individualist
naturally doesn't want to praise the achievements of revolutionary people or inspire them to courage in battle and faith in victory. A type like this is only a termite in the revolutionary ranks, and the revolutionary people don't need his "praise."

"It is not a question of position; my position is right, my intentions are good, and I understand the issues, but because my expression is bad my work ends up having the wrong effect." I have already explained above the dialectical materialist view of the relation between motive and effect; now I want to ask whether or not the question of effect is a question of position. For someone to perform a task solely on the basis of his motives and not bother about its effect is equivalent to a doctor only being concerned with making out prescriptions and not caring whether his patients die as a result, or like a political party only being concerned with issuing manifestos and not bothering to see whether they are carried out or not; how is a position like this still correct? Are the intentions still good? Of course, even when we take into account the possible effect of something beforehand, mistakes can still occur, but are our intentions still good if we persist in doing something that has already been shown to have a bad effect in practice? We judge parties or doctors by looking at their practice or their results, and the same is true of writers. Genuinely good intentions necessarily involve considering the effects of what we do, summarizing our past experience, and studying various methods or what are known as techniques of expression. They must involve totally sincere self-criticism of shortcomings and mistakes in our work and a firm resolution to correct them. This is how the method of self-criticism among communists was adopted. This is the only position that is correct. At the same time, the only way we can come to understand what the correct position is and maintain our grasp on it is through a process of serious and responsible practice along these lines. If we don't advance along these lines in our practice and just say complacently that "we understand," we haven't really understood at all.

"Studying" leads to repeating the mistakes of the dialectical materialist method of creative work, which hinders creativity. Studying Marxism-Leninism only requires us to observe the world, society, literature, and art from the point of view of dialectical materialism and historical materialism; it certainly doesn't require us to write lectures on philosophy in works of literature and art. Marxism-Leninism can include

but not replace realism in literary and artistic creation, just as it can include but not replace theories of the atom or electron in physics. It's true that empty, dry, and dogmatic formulas will destroy creativity, but more than that, they will first destroy Marxism-Leninism. Dogmatic Marxism-Leninism is not Marxism-Leninism at all but anti-Marxism-Leninism. Then Marxism-Leninism won't destroy creativity after all? Yes, it will, it will definitely destroy feudal, bourgeois, petty bourgeois, liberal, individualist, nihilist, art-for-art's sake, aristocratic, decadent, pessimistic, and other kinds of creativity that are alien to the popular masses and the proletariat. Should mentalities like these be destroyed among proletarian writers and artists? Yes, I think so, they should be thoroughly destroyed, and while they are being destroyed, something new can be established.

5.

What does the existence of these questions among our writers and artists in Yan'an tell us? It tells us that incorrect working styles still exist to a serious degree among our writers and artists, and that many shortcomings such as idealism, foreign dogmatism, idle speculation, contempt for practice, and isolation from the masses still exist among our comrades, a situation that requires a realistic and serious movement to correct our work styles.

Many of our comrades are still not very clear about the difference between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. Many party members have joined the party on an organizational level, but haven't made a full commitment on the ideological level, or even any commitment at all; these people still carry around a lot of exploiters' filth in their heads and are fundamentally ignorant of what proletarian ideology, communism, and the party are. They think that proletarian ideology is just the same old story. Little do they realize that it is by no means easy to acquire: some people spend a lifetime without ever getting close to being a true party member and invariably end up leaving the party. Of course, some people are even worse: on the organizational level, they join the Japanese party, Wang Jingwei's party, or the Special Branch of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords party, but afterwards they also bore their way into the Communist party or Communist-led organizations, advertising themselves as "party
members" and "revolutionaries." As a result, although the vast majority of people in our party and in our ranks are true, nevertheless, if we are to lead the revolutionary movement to develop in a better way and be the sooner completed, then we must conscientiously put in order our internal affairs on both ideological and organizational levels. We have to put things in order ideologically before we can tackle the organizational level and begin an ideological struggle between the proletariat and non-proletarian classes. An ideological struggle has already begun among writers and artists in Yan'an, which is very necessary. People of petty bourgeois origins always persist in expressing themselves through a variety of ways and means, including literature and art, propagating their own proposals and urging people to remake the party and the rest of the world in the image of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia. Under these conditions our job is to raise our voices and say, "Comrades," this game of yours won't work, the proletariat and the popular masses can't accept your terms; following your course would be in fact following the big landlords and big bourgeoisie; that way we'd run the risk of losing our party, our country, and our own heads. Who are the only people we can rely on? We must rely on the proletariat and its vanguard to remake the party and the rest of the world in their image. We hope that the comrades who are writers and artists recognize the seriousness of this great debate and participate actively in the struggle directed toward the enemy, friends, comrades, and ourselves, so that every cadre is strengthened and our entire ranks are genuinely united and consolidated on both the ideological and organizational level.

Because of their many ideological problems, many of our comrades are also largely unable to distinguish correctly between base areas and nonbase areas and in consequence make many mistakes. Many comrades have come from Shanghai garrisons, and the passage from garrison to base involves not just two different localities but two different historical eras. One is a semi-feudal, semicolonial society ruled by big landlords and the big bourgeoisie; the other is a revolutionary new democratic society under the leadership of the proletariat. To arrive in a base area is to arrive in a period of rule unprecedented in the several thousand years of Chinese history, one where workers, peasants, and soldiers, the popular masses hold power; the people we encompass, the object of our propaganda, are now completely different. The eras of the past are gone forever and will never return. We must therefore join together with the new masses, without the slightest hesitation. If comrades living among the masses are still like the "heroes without a battlefield, remote and uncomprehending" that I spoke about before, then they will find themselves in difficulties not only when they go down to the villages but even right here in Yan'an. Some comrades think, "Why don't I write for readers in the general area that's something I know well and it's also a matter of national significance." This kind of thinking is completely incorrect. The general area is also changing and readers there don't need to listen to writers from base areas repeating the same boring old tales; they're hoping that writers in base areas will present them with new characters, a new world. The national significance of a piece of work, therefore, is wholly dependent on its serving the masses in the base areas.

Since we must join in the new era of the masses, we must thoroughly resolve the question of the relationship between the individual and the masses. Lu Xun's couplet,

Stern browed I coolly face the fingers of a thousand men,
Head bowed I'm glad to be an ox for little children,

should become our motto. The "thousand men" are the enemy, we will never submit to any enemy no matter how ferocious. The "children" are the proletariat and the popular masses. All Communist Party members, all revolutionaries, and all revolutionary workers in literature and art should follow Lu Xun's example and be an ox for the proletariat and the popular masses, wearing themselves out in their service with no release until death. The intelligentsia must join in with the masses and serve them; this process of and definitely will involve a great many trials and hardships, but as long as we are resolute, these demands are within our grasp.
In my talk today I have only covered a few fundamental questions on the direction to take in our literary and art movement, and there are still many concrete questions that require further study. I believe that our comrades are resolved to take this direction. I believe that in the process of correcting their work styles, in the long period ahead of study and work, our comrades can definitely transform themselves and their work, creating many fine works that will be enthusiastically welcomed by workers, peasants, and soldiers, and the popular masses, and pushing forward the literary and art movement in the base areas throughout the whole country toward a glorious new stage.

APPENDIX 1:
MAJOR CHANGES FROM THE 1943/1944 TEXT TO THE 1953/1966 TEXT*

1. correct relationship: relationship
2. national liberation: popular liberation
3. slavish culture: compradore culture
4. Red Army struggles: revolutionary struggles
5. Omit: and each fought as an independent army
6. integrating with the people's movement: completely integrating with the popular masses
7. They are: I believe they are
8. friends: allies in the popular front
9. proletariat: popular masses
10. Omit: Should we "praise" the enemy, Japanese fascists and all other enemies of the people? Certainly not, because they are the very worst kind of reactionaries. They may have some superiority on a technical level, so that we can say, for example, that their guns and artillery are quite good, but good weapons in their hands are reactionary. The task of our armed forces is to capture their weapons and turn them against the enemy to seize victory.
11. cultural army: workers in revolutionary literature and art

* These are the changes that survive translation. An exhaustive list of all changes can be found in Mō Takutō shū (see Appendix 2, item 8).