

LIU SHAO-CH'I'S SELF-EXAMINATION

Canton, T'i-yu Chan-pao (Sports Combat New), 10 September 1967

[Full text. T'i-yu Chan-pao is published by its own editorial department of the Revolutionary Joint Headquarters of the Athletic Department, Canton Physical Culture Institute.]

To fighters of the New August 1 Combat Regiment of Peking Building Construction Industry Institute:

To all revolutionary teachers, students and staff members of Peking Building Construction Industry Institute:

On the evening of July 4, Comrade Wang Tung-hsing, director of the General Office of the CCP Central Committee, informed me that the Party Central Committee wanted me to write an examination for the fighters of the New August 1 Combat Regiment of the Building Construction Industry Institute. My examination is as follows:

(I)

Toward the end of July 1966, our great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander and great helmsman Chairman Mao called on all responsible comrades of the Central Committee and responsible comrades who came to Peking from various areas to take a personal part in the great proletarian cultural revolution going on in various schools in Peking. The object was to acquire perceptual knowledge.

In response to this call by Chairman Mao, on August 1 last year I went to Comrade Li Hsueh-feng's office and discussed with the comrades of the new Peking Municipal Party Committee the question of which school I should go to. After the discussion, it was unanimously decided that I should go to the Building Construction Industry Institute. Comrade Li Hsueh-feng also decided to go along. Since the Building Material Industry Ministry was led by the State Building Construction Commission, so Comrade Ku Mu also went to your institute to participate in the great cultural revolution. At the time, I asked the Cultural Revolution Group of the Central Committee to send some people to participate, and it sent Comrade Ch'i Pen-yu. At the time, the several of us did not have the idea of creating experiences and popularizing them in the whole country.

On the evening of August 2, I came to your institute to attend your rally. The above-mentioned comrades also came along. In addition, we had Liu Lan-t'ao and several other comrades who came to Peking from other areas. They decided to participate only then and there. I had no knowledge in advance.

I attended your August 2 rally mainly for the purpose of hearing some different opinions among you. And finally I spoke a few words.

On the evening of August 3, Comrades Li Hsueh-feng, Ku Mu, and Ch'i Pen-yu and I again came to your institute. We talked first with the representatives of the "August 1 Regiment" and then with the representatives of the "Revolutionary Regiment." Our main purpose was also to hear their opinions. Finally, I talked to the representatives of the "August 1 Regiment" and the "Revolutionary Regiment" separately about several opinions of mine.

On the evening of August 4, while the Chungnanhai I had a talk with the responsible comrades of the work team. In the main I asked them a few questions and finally I said something.

On August 5, Chairman Mao's big-character poster bombarding the headquarters came out. It was then that I knew I had made grave mistakes in this great proletarian cultural revolution. At that time I already felt that I could no longer interfere with the affairs of the Building Construction Industry Institute. On the afternoon that day, I told Comrade Li Hsueh-feng over the phone that I would not go to the Building Construction

Industry Institute again and would not interfere with its affairs. I had no knowledge about Comrade Li Hsueh-feng's speech on August 5 or of a later speech by Wu Hsing-feng at the Building Construction Industry Institute. After August 5, several students of the Institute wrote to me, and I also received several brief bulletins. But I did not reply. Some of these I sent to Comrade Li Hsueh-feng, and some I handled myself.

The above is a brief account of my participation in the great proletarian cultural revolution at the Peking Building Construction Industry Institute.

(II)

On June 1 last year (1966), after the publication in the whole country, which was approved by Chairman Mao himself, of the first Marxist-Leninist big-character poster by Comrade Nieh Yuan-tzu and six other comrades of Peking University, the great proletarian cultural revolution movement in Peking and in other parts of the nation was unfolded with great fanfare. However, in the 50 days and more after June 1, last year, I made a mistake in line and in orientation while guiding the great proletarian cultural revolution. I should bear the main responsibility for this mistake, although other comrades -- such as other leading comrades of the Central Committee who were in Peking, the leading comrades of certain ministries and commissions of the State Council, the leading comrades of the new Peking Municipal Party Committee, the leading comrades of certain work teams, and certain leading comrades of other localities -- also had a certain responsibility. I began to understand this mistake I myself had made only after Chairman Mao's big-character poster bombarding the headquarters came out on August 5. Before that, I did not know that I had committed such a grave error.

For some time prior to July 18 last year, the daily work of the Party Central Committee was in my charge in the absence of Chairman Mao. The conditions of the great cultural revolution in various respects in Peking were regularly reported at meetings of the Central Committee over which I presided. These meetings made some wrong decisions, approved or agreed to some wrong suggestions.

For instance:

— Sending out a large number of work teams to various universities, middle schools and some State organs in Peking.

— Devising some measures for restricting the revolutionary actions of the masses, such as drawing a line of distinction between people inside and outside an organization, forbidding the masses to demonstrate in the streets, prohibiting pasting big-character posters in the streets.

— Distributing Brief Bulletin No. 9 on the cultural revolution in Peking University to Party committees in various localities, describing the

revolutionary actions of the revolutionary teachers and students as counter-revolutionary incidents.

— Distributing reports and discussion summaries which some bureaus of the Central Committee submitted to the Central Committee concerning the great proletarian cultural revolution, and so on.

In many schools in Peking, the so-called struggle for "eliminating interference" was conducted. In the Building Construction Industry Institute, the so-called struggle for "eliminating interference" became a struggle for "catching swimming fish." But I had no knowledge of it beforehand, nor did I hear anything about "catching swimming fish" at meetings of the Central Committee. Such a struggle gave rise to the phenomenon where in many schools, under the leadership of the work teams, students struggled against each other, freedom of the person was restricted and other illegal acts were committed, revolutionaries were encircled and attacked, dissent was suppressed, and even some students were branded as "counterrevolutionaries," "rightists," "sham Leftists," "swimming fish," etc. As a result, in this period the general orientation of the struggle was shifted, and many schools were engulfed by an atmosphere of white terror. Such an atmosphere of terror was reactionary; it was an atmosphere of white terror.

When the work teams first went to various schools, they were generally welcomed by the masses. Very soon, however, differences of opinion arose among the masses. Some criticized and doubted the leadership of the work teams or the opinions of certain of their members. Others criticized and doubted the opinions of certain leaders of the Party. When the majority of the work teams did a lot of things that should have been done by the mass movement and placed many restrictions on it, this naturally gave rise to discontent and doubts among the masses. Even if some speeches were too drastic, they were revolutionary speeches which demonstrated the speakers' courage to think, to speak, to struggle, and to rebel. Of course, there were a small number of rightist speeches. This, to be sure, was a normal thing. Adequate time should be allowed for all kinds of opinions to be fully expressed, fully debated and made clear.

But precisely at this critical moment, one after another of those erroneous decisions mentioned above were made at meetings of the Central Committee held to hear reports — meetings at which I presided. In the 50 days and more after the work teams were sent out, I gave consistent support to the work teams. This, then, added to the possibility of the work teams making mistakes, and added to the gravity of the mistakes which were made. The majority of the responsible members of the work teams neither understood the great proletarian cultural revolution nor properly learned from the masses. At the very outset they asked the broad masses who had been aroused to act according to the plans and steps which we and the work teams conceived on the basis of our subjective wishes. This ran counter to the law governing the development of the revolutionary mass movement, and many serious incidents occurred. In fact, we took the reactionary bourgeois stand,

practiced bourgeois dictatorship, suppressed the great cultural revolution which was then vigorously developing, confused the right and the wrong, the white and the black, thereby inflating the arrogance of the bourgeoisie and demoralizing the proletariat.

Even at this moment I still did not wake up, not knowing that the creation of such a situation was extremely abnormal, extremely unfavorable to the great proletarian cultural revolution, and extremely unfavorable to the cause of the Party and the socialist cause. This was a mistake having to do with the Right opportunist line. In a short span of 50 days and more, the damage and influence caused by the mistake of this kind were tremendous. Up to now, the consequences have not been entirely eliminated; in some places they have even been aggravated, bringing about serious feeling of opposition between the masses.

This mistake of mine runs counter to Mao Tse-tung's thought and to the theories, lines, principles and policies concerning the great proletarian cultural revolution as set forth in the circular of May 16, 1966.

### (III)

It was Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee which asked me to take charge of the daily routine of the Party Central Committee in case Chairman Mao was not in Peking. Owing to the fact that prior to August 5, last year I still did not understand my mistake in line and orientation made in the great proletarian cultural revolution, so in several speeches at the Building Construction Industry Institute I did not take the initiative to admit my responsibility, and I did not formally stand out and straightforwardly tell all the teachers and students of the Institute that I should bear the main responsibility for the various mistakes made in the initial period of the great cultural revolution in the Institute in order to lessen the responsibility of the other leading comrades of the Central Committee who were then in Peking, of the new Peking Municipal Party Committee, of the Building Material Industry Ministry and of the work teams.

At that time I just said in a generalized way that the work team had made mistakes in your Institute. The responsibility for the mistakes could not be borne entirely by the work team; the Party Central Committee and the new Peking Municipal Party Committee were also responsible... You were clear about the mistakes made by the work team in your Institute, and you might discuss them. You might also discuss the mistakes of the Party Central Committee and the new Peking Municipal Party Committee. One should be responsible for one's mistakes. Here, I did not say that I should bear the main responsibility, nor did I say that time the daily work of the Party Central Committee was in my charge in the absence of Chairman Mao. As a result, as to who should bear the main responsibility for the mistakes made at that time it was far from clear. At that time, what I said was incorrect.

I attended your all-Institute debate on August 2, and heard two kinds of different opinion. Besides, the students handed me a slip, proposing a third different opinion. Although these different opinions included some questions of principle and of orientation, yet I believed that basically they were still different opinions within the ranks of the people and should be discussed and debated in a normal way, so that the right could be distinguished from the wrong, what was correct could be upheld, what was wrong could be corrected, and it might be possible to unite one and all. This was because the great proletarian cultural revolution had to rely on the revolutionary students, revolutionary teachers, and revolutionary staff members to unite with all people who could be united with before it could be successful. The great cultural revolution in a school should be undertaken mainly by the students. I believed that unity which was achieved on the basis of a desire for unity and after adequate discussions and debates — in the course of which the right was distinguished from the wrong, the truth was upheld and the mistakes were corrected — was precisely what we needed at that time. We could not say that such unity was "combining two into one." Here, of course, I should make an examination. At that time, I did not elaborate sufficiently or correctly enough on this question.

After hearing the opinions of various quarters on August 2 and 3 last year and again hearing the speeches by leading comrades of the work team on August 4, there gradually formed in my mind the following impression: The orientation of struggle adhered to by the "August 1 Combat Regiment" was a correct one; they were firmly opposed to the erroneous leadership of the original Party Committee of the Institute and the work team, and their proletarian revolutionary rebel spirit was good. On the other hand, the "Revolutionary Regiment," though they too said that the leadership of the Institute Party Committee and the work team had shortcomings and made mistakes, basically protected both, because members of the "Revolutionary Regiment" were the hoodwinked. They pointed the spearhead of their struggle not at the Party Committee or the work team, but mainly at the "August 1 Regiment." For this reason, the general orientation of their struggle was fundamentally wrong. My view on this was basically identical with the views of the new Peking Municipal Party Committee. Yet I did not in time tell this view of mine to the teachers, students and staff members of the Institute. Only in my talk with Comrades of the work team on August 4 did I mention this briefly — and then not in a very general manner.

Besides this, during my contacts with various quarters I also found that the Party and League organizations at the Building Construction Industry Institute were still controlled by the same set of men. They had not held any re-election, nor did they cease to carry out activities. For this reason, the activities of the Party and League organizations were often aimed at maintaining the old order and at opposing the revolutionary rebel spirit and the revolutionary rebel actions. Hence, I once suggested re-election of the Party and League organizations. If it proved impossible to hold an election for the time being, temporary convenors might be elected. On the whole, Party and League members should not hold secret meetings.

When meetings were held, people outside the Party and the League — in a number doubling their own — should be invited to attend. The aim of this suggestion of mine was to prevent the great cultural revolution at the time from being controlled by the original Party and League organizations, which tried only to obstruct the development of the movement. Was my suggestion adopted? If the answer was affirmative, did it cause the majority of the cadres in the Institute to be attacked? I do not know. If the majority of the cadres were attacked because of the adoption of my suggestion, then I should take the main responsibility.

In my several speeches I also touched on the following problems:

1. Some people rose to make trouble and to rebel against our Party Committee and work team. We should not be afraid; we should support them in rising to make trouble and to rebel, even if a small number of bad people also participated. This was because the overwhelming majority of them were good people and supported the Chinese Communist Party, socialism and Chairman Mao. Bad people were only a minority. If we were afraid that some people rose to make trouble and prevented them from rebelling against us, then we would surely make mistakes in orientation. However, in explaining this question, I talked too much, and I said this: "Don't be afraid that bad people go on to the stage, for this may do us some good. You can kill a snake only when it comes out of the cave." These words were wrong and should be refuted.

2. In several speeches I emphasized the need to unite with the majority and unite with all people who could be united with. I did not explain that all people with whom unity is possible should be united and a great revolutionary alliance and revolutionary "three-way combination" should be realized with the proletarian revolutionaries as the core and under the premise of the sameness of general orientation. Without taking the proletarian revolutionaries as the core and without the premise of the sameness of general orientation, it would be impossible to realize a great revolutionary alliance and revolutionary "three-way combination." Even if they were realized, they could not be consolidated.

3. In my several speeches I quoted from Marx: "The proletariat can liberate itself only by liberating the whole mankind." As to the question of what people should be included in the liberation of the whole mankind, I first of all pointed that they included the workers, peasants and other working people, students, and intellectuals. They constituted the bulk of humanity. However, they also included landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad people, rightists and capitalists who had not been sentenced to death, and also included the wives and children of those who had been sentenced to death. All of them need to be reformed. And to reform these people, a great deal of work had to be done. As a result, when dealing with the transformation of the remnants of these exploiting classes, I talked too much and paid too much attention to them. This aroused the feeling on the part of people that I had stood matter on its end. This was wrong.

As for the mistakes which I had made at the Peking Building Construction Industry Institute and their bad influence, I ask the comrades to freely expose and criticize them.

As regards my erroneous guiding ideas and their evil influence in the early period of the great proletarian cultural revolution, I ask the comrades to freely expose and criticize them.

As regards my other speeches and actions, I also ask the comrades to freely expose and thoroughly criticize those which do not conform to the great thought of Mao Tse-tung.

Finally, I extend my apology to the revolutionary teachers, students and staff members who have been suppressed and harmed by the erroneous line which I represent! Those revolutionary teachers, students and staff members and the broad masses of members of the work teams who were hoodwinked by the erroneous line and who made mistakes under varying degrees in the initial period of the great proletarian cultural revolution bear little responsibility. The main responsibility rests with me. They two are the victims of the erroneous line, and I also want to extend my apology to them!

I hope that while exposing and criticizing me, our comrades will form a great revolutionary alliance and revolutionary "three-way combination" with the proletarian revolutionaries as the core, and build Peking Building Construction Industry Institute into a red great school for Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Carry through the great proletarian cultural revolution to the end!

Long live the proletarian revolutionary rebel spirit!

Long live the great, glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party!

Long live the great and invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung!

Long live the great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander and great helmsman Chairman Mao! A long, long life to him!

Liu Shao-ch'i (Signed)

July 9, 1967