

CHIN SHENG-T'AN AND 'LEGEND OF THE WATER'S EDGE'

Shanghai HSUEH-HSI YU P'I-P'ING [Study and Criticism] in Chinese  
No 10, Oct 75 pp 24-31

[Article by Lo Szu-ting [5012 1835 7844]: "A Controversial Case of the Past 300 Years -- Chin Sheng-t'an's Abridgment of 'Legend of the Water's Edge' and the Controversies"]

[Text] Originally, the popular editions of the "Legend of the Water's Edge" [Hereinafter referred to as the "Legend"] consisted of either 100 or 120 chapters. At the end of the Ming Dynasty, a man by the name of Chin Sheng-t'an [6855 5110 0855] chopped it down to 70 chapters. Once this was done, there were people who condemned it and those who defended it, and it became a controversial case of the past 300 and odd years. Does the abridged version truly present the features of the original work? Why have there been so many people showing such a strong interest? This is the contents of this article.

I

The Marxists find the abridged version of the novel not truthful.

Yet Chin Sheng-t'an was pleased with himself. He bragged: "To have 70 chapters in one novel is certainly very elaborate. The [final] chapter can be considered the grand finale. When reading it, it is like a group of dragons, after travelling 1,000 li, plunge into the sea together. There is not the slightest unfinished feeling. How very ridiculous for Lo Kuan-chung [5012 6306 0022] to add a tail on the side of the dog, making it hideous!"<sup>1</sup> Whether 100 or 120 chap-

---

<sup>1</sup> "Photolithographic Edition of 'Legend of the Water's Edge,'" published by Kuan-hua-t'ang and annotated and revised by Chin Sheng-t'an," vol 75 p 1

ters, Chin Sheng-t'an claimed that they were spurious, not genuine, and that they were "popular versions with unauthorized revisions, foolish and self-assertive."<sup>1</sup> Only his 70-chapter version was the genuine "ancient edition"<sup>2</sup> and truthful.

The facts are exactly contrary thereto. Chin Sheng-t'an himself was not truthful. He chopped off the latter part of the novel, fabricated the chapter on Lu Tsun-i's "Alarm over a Bad Dream," and ended the story with Chi Shu-yeh's massacre of all 108 braves of Liang-shan. Lu Hsun [7627 6598] was very dissatisfied over this and specifically wrote "on Chin Sheng-t'an." He declared that the 70-chapter version was "a dragonfly without a tail" and lost "the truthfulness of the original work." He pointed out sharply: "Most likely he was not in possession of any ancient edition, but made the abridgment according to his own feelings. When he mentioned an ancient edition, it was his means of 'basing on the ancient.'" ("Historical Changes of China's Novels.")

Chapter 42 of the "Legend" is the outline of the entire novel. Through the decree of the goddess Chiu-t'ien Hsuan-nu, the author pointed out the main theme of the book, which was to spread surrender-ism, and provided the basic thread of the story from Chapter 71 on. The goddess made it very clear to Sung Chiang: "You must carry out the principles for Heaven; serve with loyalty and faith; assist the nation and comfort the people; leave the evil and follow the righteous. In the future, when you have accomplished your missions, you will become a high official." She also left him with four lines of "Heavenly words" to encourage him. These four lines were omitted in the 70-chapter version. To plug the loopholes, Chin Sheng-t'an made many deletions. But no matter how much he deleted, the theme of surrender-ism advocated by the novel could not be wiped out, and the result was merely endless flaws in the story. Yet Chin Sheng-t'an bragged that "there is not the slightest unfinished feeling." He was merely deceiving others as well as himself.

Chin Sheng-t'an claimed that his tail-less "Legend" truthfully reflected the original intent of the author. Such words were not truthful. Though the novel was completed between the end of the Yuan Dynasty and the beginning of the Ming Dynasty, the story was based on popular legends since the South Sung Dynasty. After the additions and revisions and stage performances through the years, it was gradually enriched and perfected. Whether the version of the Sung Dynasty or that of the Yuan Dynasty, the amnesty and surrender of Sung Chiang were included. When it was made into a novel, the

---

1, 2 Op. cit., vol 75, p 23

author concentrated his entire effort on praising and embellishing Sung Chiang, the surrender-ist. When Chin Sheng-t'an declared that the author "detested and hated Sung Chiang to the extreme,"<sup>1</sup> he was merely demonstrating his own confusion. Even after his painstaking revision in the 70-chapter version of the novel, Sung Chiang, rather than an "outlaw chief" going "underground,"<sup>2</sup> was really a loyal feudal slave. As a result of following the surrender-ist line, he would inevitably accept amnesty. That Chin Sheng-t'an allowed Sung Chiang to be beheaded in the "bad dream" was completely against the author's true intent to advocate surrender-ism through Sung Chiang.

Chin Sheng-t'an was originally named Jen-juí [0086 3843], also known as Sheng-t'an, "commended" [t'an] by the Sages" [sheng] as well as being the "auspicious" [juí] among "men" [jen]; therefore, he was a self-styled feudal defender. By abridging the "Legend," he considered himself as speaking for the sages and truthfully and completely reflecting the viewpoint and intent of the entire feudal ruling class, but this was an untruth. Due to the differences in economic and political interests, the feudal ruling class was divided into different cliques and factions. After offending certain officials, he was executed for being involved in the "Case of Lamenting at the Temple" in the early years of the Ch'ing Dynasty, which indicated that he only belonged to a particular clique and a particular faction of the landlord class. His chopped off "Legend" could not represent the viewpoint and intent of the entire feudal ruling class, but only the interest of a certain faction in the landlord class.

History often mocks. Chin Sheng-t'an felt that only he himself was a true disciple of the sages and refused to acknowledge the qualifications of Sung Chiang as a feudal defender. Yet some people in the feudal class considered Chin Sheng-t'an an undesirable heretic and refused to acknowledge his qualifications as a feudal defender. Chin Sheng-t'an only executed Sung Chiang, who was loyal to the feudal court, in Lu Tsun-i's bad dream, while he himself was actually executed by the feudal court to which he was loyal. Chin Sheng-t'an could not tolerate Sung Chiang's opportunist action of fleeing to Liang-shan; similarly, the feudal government could not tolerate Chin Sheng-t'an's transgression of "lamenting at the temple." Such complex and strange situations may be completely explained from the class source. The different political factions within the landlord class reflected the divergence in their economic position and the differences in their background and upbringing. As long as such divergences and differences remained, the existence of factions was

---

1 Op. cit., vol 3, p 1

2 Op. cit., vol 39, p 5; vol 22, p 1

inevitable. The insatiable essence of the landlord class determined its internal death struggle over the redistribution of assets and power. Chin Sheng-t'an started from the standpoint of the exterminating faction toward the end of the Ming Dynasty; therefore, he inevitably considered Sung Chiang, a surrender-ist appreciated by the pacifying faction, as a "heretic," and had to have him beheaded in the dream. The officials south of the Yangtze River at the beginning of the Ch'ing Dynasty started from the standpoint of the in-power faction, considered Chin Sheng-t'an, who was of the out-of-office faction and only slightly involved in the "Case of Lamenting at the Temple," a "heretic," and had to behead him at the execution ground. Chin Sheng-t'an's "killing" of Sung Chiang and his own execution were, at the very bottom, a result of the dog-eat-dog dispute within the landlord class.

## II

The 70-chapter "Legend" annotated and revised by Chin Sheng-t'an created a medium size storm at the time and thereafter. Actually a political case, it was a continuation of the struggle between the two factions within the reactionary ruling class, i. e., a continuation in real life of the struggle between Sung Chiang and Kao Ch'iu in the novel.

Kao Ch'iu was both stubborn and mediocre. He opposed the alternate application of "extermination" and "pacification," and advocated the former while discarding the latter. Chin Sheng-t'an was also a Kao Ch'iu. He only understood slaughtering, but not surrender by inducement; he only wanted Chi Shu-yeh, but not Sung Chiang. Lu Hsun profoundly pointed out: "It was very mediocre to cut off the latter part of the 'Legend of the Water's Edge' and dream of a 'Chi Shu-yeh' to slaughter Sung Chiang and his group." ("On Chin Sheng-t'an"). The butcher knife of Chi Shu-yeh could only kill the physical body of the peasants, while the deception of the surrender-ists such as Sung Chiang could destroy their fighting determination. The effect of the latter could not have been achieved by 100, or 1,000, Chi Shu-yeh's. Lenin once pointed out: "All the oppressing classes, to preserve their own control, need two kinds of social functions: The function of the executioner and that of the minister." ("The Bankruptcy of the Second International"). In suppressing and destroying the Liangshan rebel army, Chi Shu-yeh played the role of the executioner while Sung Chiang assumed that of the minister. If Sung Chiang and his group were all killed, who would play the role of the reactionary minister to comfort and deceive the revolutionary peasants? Furthermore, Sung Chiang, in the process of capitulation, proved that, in carrying out the functions of a counter-revolutionary executioner, he was not only not any inferior than Chi Shu-yeh, but even more efficient.

In the Ch'ing Dynasty, those taking the side of Chin Sheng-t'an belonged mostly to a group of big and small Kao Ch'iu's. They all firmly advocated suppression and opposed amnesty. Little feudal bureaucrat Wang Wang-ju [3769 2598 1172] in the early Ch'ing Dynasty specially liked Chin Sheng-t'an's conclusion of the 70-chapter "Legend" with Lu Tsun-i's bad dream, claiming that it was "of great service to the sages" and made "the thieves tremble in fear."<sup>1</sup> Full of praises for Chin Sheng-t'an, Yu Wan-ch'un [0205 8001 2504] in the reign of Tao-kuang, Ch'ing Dynasty, harshly condemned the 100-chapter and 120-chapter versions as "spurious" and extolled the 70-chapter version as the genuine work of Shih Nai-an [2457 5082 1658].<sup>2</sup> He stressed: "If one is loyal and faithful, one cannot be a bandit; if one is a bandit, one cannot be loyal and faithful."<sup>3</sup> For this reason, he specially wrote the novel entitled "Record of the Destruction of the Rebels" as a sequel to the "Legend" and let the descendants of Chu-chia-chuang village kill all 108 braves of Liang-shan in order to prove that "Sung Chiang never surrendered to the government."<sup>4</sup> Those like Wang and Yu could not comprehend the true intent of spreading surrender-ism through Sung Chiang in the "Legend" and were unable and unwilling to concede that such surrender-ists like Sung Chiang mingled among the peasant army were the same type of people as themselves. They felt that only by killing all the uprising peasants would the revolutionary people "tremble in fear" and lose the courage to rebel. However, this type of people was actually very mediocre. The revolutionary peasants could not be all killed off. The insane massacres by the reactionary rulers could only stir up a more fierce resistance on the part of the revolutionary peasants. Precisely as stated by Lu Hsun: "As long as the rock is there, so will the tinder." (Draft of "Title Undecided," "Ch'ieh-chieh-t'ing Miscellanies.")

But some people were even more mediocre, and Kuei Chuang [2981 1641] in early Ch'ing Dynasty was one of them. He frankly considered the "Legend" as "a book advocating rebellion."<sup>5</sup> He declared that Chin Sheng-t'an's abridgment and annotations elevated the position of the "Legend," "confused man's mind, hammed the customs, and disrupted learning," and "death was inadequate to punish him for his crimes."<sup>6</sup> In Kuei Chuang's pedantic mind, besides feudal classics, one should only learn to write the eight-paragraph essay and, when it came to

---

1 "Wang Wang-ju's Annotations," p 1, at the beginning of "Annotated Legend of the Water's Edge"

2, 3, 4 Yu Chung-hua [0205 0112 5478]: "Record of the Destruction of the Rebels," Shang-wu Printing Press edition, vol 1, p 1

5, 6 "Executing the Evil Ghosts," appendix to "Kuei Yuan-kung's Writings"

the "Legend," etc., they should all be burnt and destroyed. Chin Sheng-t'an negated Sung Chiang but affirmed the "Legend," while Kuei Chuang negated both Sung Chiang and the "Legend," including Chin Sheng-t'an. Such historical phenomenon is worth analyzing. In the confrontation between the peasants and the landlord class, the revolutionary peasants hoisted the red flag while the feudal ruling class hoisted the white flag. The division was clear, and there could be no confusion. However, surrender-ists such as Sung Chiang displayed a grey flag of mixed colors. If one called it a red flag, there was white in the background; if one called it a white flag, there was red on the surface. Failing to see the white under the red, Li K'uei and Wu Yung in the "Legend" mistook it as a red flag. As a result, with the false red flag of "carrying out the principles for Heaven," which was a true white flag, Sung Chiang replaced Chao Kai's revolutionary red flag and put an end to the revolutionary cause of Liang-shan. Seeing only the red smeared over the white, Chin Sheng-t'an and his supporters also mistook the flag as red. Therefore, he chopped off the latter portion of the "Legend" and stopped the people from raising the red flag again by threat of death. Meanwhile, those like Kuei Chuang felt that, as long as there was any contact with red, whether such red was true or false, it should be burnt and destroyed, in order to avoid reminding the people of the red flag. He felt that Chin Sheng-t'an's revision of the "Legend" was superfluous, and that the best counter-revolutionary method was to refuse to acknowledge that there ever was a red flag in the world. It was entirely the attitude of the ostrich. From the author of the "Legend" to Chin Sheng-t'an, then to Kuei Chuang, though they all took the landlord class standpoint, they became ever more undisguised, and ever more mediocre.

Not all those who praised Chin Sheng-t'an's abridgment of the "Legend" were mediocre. Some people recognized the ingenuity of the original "Legend." Japanese bourgeois scholar Shioya On praised the abridgment as "keeping the magnificent first part" and "letting the feelings of the 'Legend' shoot up 100,000 feet."<sup>1</sup> He could be considered Chin Sheng-t'an's overseas intimate. Nevertheless, if we study it more carefully, we will find it not so. Chin Sheng-t'an opposed Sung Chiang while Shioya On affirmed him. It was a big divergence. What Shioya On affirmed was the "Legend" chopped off by Chin Sheng-t'an, but he did not support Chin Sheng-t'an's purpose in doing so. Different from Chin Sheng-t'an, he could appreciate the great pains taken to spread surrender-ism through Sung Chiang in the "Legend," but he thought the 100-chapter and 120-chapter versions depicting

---

1 Shioya On: "Discussions of Chinese Literature," K'ai-ming Bookstore, 1929 Chinese translation edition, p 417

the entire process of Sung Chiang's surrender lacked subtlety. After the abridgment by Chin Sheng-t'an, Sung Chiang, in the chapter entitled "the Heroes of Liang-shan-po Are Alarmed by a Bad Dream," became a noble and sacrificing peasant hero, and Shioya On found it extremely exquisite.<sup>1</sup> Yes, the objective result of the abridgment made from his subjective motive had never been imagined by Chin Sheng-t'an. Subjectively he wished to disparage Sung Chiang, but objectively he raised his level. Subjectively he misunderstood the original intent of the "Legend," but objectively he developed it. Not letting Sung Chiang accept amnesty was for the purpose of peeling off the protective coloring of the spurious red and true white "Legend." But as a result, objectively he further concealed the surrender-ist essence of the novel and the true surrender-ist features of Sung Chiang, making them even more deceptive. Thus, the mediocre Chin Sheng-t'an did something extraordinary for the reactionary rulers. Shioya On clearly realized this point. Naturally he found it extremely exquisite. Whether there was any other reason for his appreciation, Shioya On did not say. But subsequently, when Chiang Kai-shek recklessly promoted anti-communist surrender-ist activities during the war to resist Japan, a Japanese imperialist element put Shioya On's thoughts into words. He extolled the "Legend" as "unsurpassable material to study the Chinese nation."<sup>2</sup> Why was it good material? Because it advocated capitulation. The same Japanese imperialist element declared: "The position of Chiang Kai-shek today in Chungking has many similarities with the situation and feelings of Sung Chiang toward the end of Liang-shan-po."<sup>3</sup> The "Legend" was thus considered by the Japanese imperialists as "good material" to induce the undesirables of China to surrender.

### III

In the "Legend," Sung Chiang was more cunning than Kao Ch'iu. The Sung Chiang's in real life are also harder to recognize than the Kao Ch'iu's. Those of the landlord class in the Ch'ing Dynasty against Chin Sheng-t'an's abridgment all supported Sung Chiang. As early as during Emperor Ch'ien-lung's reign, some one retrieved the tail chopped off by Chin Sheng-t'an, changed the title to "Expedition against the Four Bandits," and published it as a separate novel. He declared: "Though their conduct was improper at the beginning, they suddenly realized their errors, changed their ways, and followed the right path. Their intent was commendable, and their merits could not be negated."<sup>4</sup> In today's language, "rebellion is punishable by death;

---

1 Ibid.

2 Isaka Kine: "'Legend of the Water's Edge' and the Chinese Nation," 1942 Japanese language edition, p 1

3 Op. cit., introduction by the author

4 Lu Hsun: "Brief History of China's Novels," People's Literature Publishing House, 1973 edition, p 124

capitulation is commendable." There was a feudal scholar in early Ch'ing Dynasty by the name of Ch'en Ch'en [7115 1820] who opposed the 70-chapter version, approved the 100-chapter version, and sympathized with surrender-ist Sung Chiang. However, he also expressed some dissatisfaction over the 100-chapter version. He found Kao Ch'iu's poisoning of rebel Sung Chiang too discouraging to the surrender-ists. Therefore, he wrote the "Sequel to the Legend of the Water's Edge." In his novel, Yen Ch'ing and Yang Lin risked death to sneak into camp to see Emperor Hui-tsung of the Sung Dynasty. The emperor was so moved that he praised Sung Chiang as "a loyal subject who has established much merit."<sup>1</sup> Li Tsun and others received appointments from the new emperor, became kings abroad, and enjoyed all the honor and wealth, thus adding a bright tail to the "Legend." Nevertheless, whether the tail was retrieved or added, the goal was to encourage the people to emulate the surrender-ist Sung Chiang and serve as obedient subjects by various patterns. Beheading was not enough, and this was where they were even more cunning than the mediocre Chin Sheng-t'an.

Among those opposing Chin Sheng-t'an's abridgment, some were deceived. During the time of the Hsin-hai Revolution [1911], some people, taking the national bourgeoisie standpoint, negated the 70-chapter version and affirmed the 100-chapter version. They praised the latter as "respecting the people's rights; developing justice" and criticized the abridgment as a "calamity" to the "Legend."<sup>2</sup> They were deceived by the false appearance of the "Legend," and interpreted "opposing the corrupt officials only, not the emperor" as opposition to the "dictatorship government of several thousand years."<sup>3</sup> In addition, there was a very profound class source. China's national bourgeoisie had thousands of links with imperialism and the feudal class. Docility, compromise, and vacillation came from the wombs. To forgive others was for the purpose of forgiving oneself. That China's national bourgeoisie forgave Sung Chiang's compromise and vacillation was to forgive such qualities in itself. The dual personality of China's national bourgeoisie, their capacity to join the revolution and to compromise with the enemies of the revolution, determined their opposition to Kao Ch'iu, their sympathy for Sung Chiang, and their ability to recognize the stubborn counter-revolutionary in Chin Sheng-t'an but not the surrender-ist in Sung Chiang who lay hidden in the revolutionary camp. This special characteristic indicated

- 
- 1 Ch'en Ch'en: "Sequel to the Legend of the Water's Edge," Shanghai Classic Literature Publishing House, 1956 edition, p 214
  - 2 Yen-nan Shang-sheng: "New Annotated Legend of the Water's Edge," Chih-li Government Bookstore
  - 3 Man: "On Novels," see "Historical Material on China's Novels," Classic Literature Publishing House, 1957 edition, pp 37-38



that it was impossible for China's national bourgeoisie to prosecute China's revolution to the final end, and that, even if it became a revolutionary ally, it would be an extremely unreliable one, easily compromised and swayed.

In this historical controversy over Chin Sheng-t'an's abridgment of the "Legend," comprador scholar Hu Shih [5170 6684] was the most cunning of them all. Such cunning was manifested when he realized that Sung Chiang and Chin Sheng-t'an were both equally useful to the reactionary rule, and he loved both of them. He loved Chin Sheng-t'an because of the latter's firm counter-revolutionary standpoint. But he loved Sung Chiang even more, because he needed those like Sung Chiang to join him and help imperialism and its running dogs "conquer the heart of the nation."<sup>1</sup> Therefore, he appreciated the stubborn attitude demonstrated by Chin Sheng-t'an in his annotations of the "Legend," praising him for his "insight and courage."<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, he opposed Chin Sheng-t'an's accusation of Sung Chiang for taking friend as foe and "interpreting Shih Nai-an's admirations for Sung Chiang as curses,"<sup>3</sup> and blamed him for being "pedantic" and "detestable."<sup>4</sup> Hu Shih's complex psychology in mixing praises in his curses of Chin Sheng-t'an, and care in his accusations reflected the indescribable difficulties in his own political life and the unique common distresses of the surrender-ists. In those years when, as the leader of the New Moon Faction, Hu Shih devoted his effort to the Kuomintang reactionaries. Due to the differences of opinion on the strategy toward the revolutionaries, he once encountered the displeasure of the Kuomintang reactionaries. Though, unlike Chin Sheng-t'an, he was fortunate enough to escape execution, he was frightened. He immediately quoted the three democratic principles in the "New Moon" magazine to defend himself and thereby saved his professorship. Therefore, he complained about Chin Sheng-t'an's "misunderstanding of the intent of the 'Legend of the Water's Edge'" and his killing off of Sung Chiang who belonged to the same camp. Meanwhile, he also regretted the fact that Chin Sheng-t'an encountered the misunderstanding of the Ch'ing government so that Chin Sheng-t'an, who was loyal to the feudal court, was killed by it. Hu Shih naturally also felt sorry for himself and was heartbroken over his reactionary masters' displeasure. All those belonging to the surrender-ist faction will inevitably smear themselves with a protective coloring. While this will increase their deception of the revolutionary people, it will also frequently lead to the misunderstanding of their colleagues in the reactionary camp, even to the extent of causing their death. How

---

1 Lu Hsun: "Ch'ieh-chieh-t'ing Miscellanies -- Two or Three Things about China"

2, 3, 4 "Research on the 'Legend of the Water's Edge,'" "Writings of Hu Shih," vol 3

very unjust! Sung Chiang, loyal to the counter-revolution, encountered the misunderstanding of the counter-revolutionary Chin Sheng-t'an; Chin Sheng-t'an, loyal to the feudal court, encountered its misunderstanding; Hu Shih and the New Moon faction, loyal to the Kuomintang reactionaries, encountered their misunderstanding. Such merry-go-round historical phenomenon reflected a most interesting struggle, a neither large nor small breach, and an itchy and painful conflict in the counter-revolutionary camp. ("On Opposing the Strategy of Japanese Imperialism.")

#### IV

In this controversy which continued for over 300 years, the representative figures of all kinds of classes and all kinds of groups succeeded one another to appear and express their opinions of Chin Sheng-t'an's abridgment of the "Legend." The focal point of the controversy always rested on the problem of how to regard the surrender-ist Sung Chiang and the surrender-ist trend advocated by the novel. Over a long period of time, the controversy remained within the counter-revolutionary camp. Whether affirming Chin Sheng-t'an and negating Sung Chiang, or negating Sung Chiang and affirming Chin Sheng-t'an, or negating, or affirming, both of them, in spite of the innumerable theories, the common goal was to suppress the revolutionary people, with certain divergences on the counter-revolutionary strategy.

Not until the end of the 1920's when Lu Hsun, the commanding general of China's cultural revolution, took part in the controversy did it take on the quality of the opposition between the revolution and counter-revolution. With the publication of "the Evolution of the Tramp" in 1929 and "on Chin Sheng-t'an" in 1933, Lu Hsun not only intensively censured Chin Sheng-t'an for his stubborn reactionary standpoint, but also stripped off the revolutionary camouflage donned by the surrender-ists like Sung Chiang, thereby presenting a clear contrast to the reactionary standpoint of Hu Shih who loved Sung Chiang as well as Chin Sheng-t'an. Lu Hsun pointed out sharply: "The novel 'Legend of the Water's Edge' made it very clear: Because they did not oppose the emperor, the moment the government army arrived, they accepted amnesty and fought other bandits for the government -- the bandits who did not 'carry out the principles for Heaven.' They were, after all, slaves." ("The Evolution of the Tramp.")

Lu Hsun's criticism of ancient reactionaries was precisely for the purpose of criticizing the current ones -- Hu Shih and his type of people. In the counter-revolutionary camp, Sung Chiang and Kao Ch'iu, and the author of the "Legend" and Chin Sheng-t'an, separately

represented two different types of reactionaries. Between the two types, Lu Hsun stressed the criticism of the former, not the latter, or, the surrender-ists in the revolutionary camp, not the stubborn faction in the counter-revolutionary camp. In regard to the stubborn reactionary elements such as Chin Sheng-t'an, their counter-revolutionary words and acts were open and exposed, and relatively easy for the revolutionary people to recognize. What was most dangerous to the revolution were the surrender-ists who appeared as revolutionaries -- revisionism misrepresenting itself as Marxism. Such counter-revolutionaries in the revolutionary camp were more concealed, more false, and more cunning than the open counter-revolutionaries, and also more deceptive. For this very reason, Lu Hsun time and again reminded the revolutionary people to raise their vigilance against them.

After the founding of the new China, under the influence of Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist line, the "Legend" and those like Sung Chiang continued to receive adulations. Before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the voluminous comments of the "Legend" were almost entirely against Lu Hsun's theories, but embellished and extolled Sung Chiang's surrender-ist line. In the early 60's, when the revisionist ideology ran wild inside and outside the country, the academic world blew the evil wind of reversing the case of Chin Sheng-t'an. The revisionists welcomed the confused interpretations on the issue of the "Legend," because such situation was favorable to their promotion of revisionism, surrender-ism, and regression. When ancient surrender-ists showed off their brilliance in books, on the stage, and on the screen, it was not easy for the people to recognize the modern surrender-ists.

Nevertheless, this situation cannot be permitted to continue any longer.

Chairman Mao recently pointed out: "The good point of the novel 'Legend of the Water's Edge' is in surrendering. Use it as negative teaching material, so that the people will know the surrender-ists." He also said: "The 'Legend of the Water's Edge' only opposed corrupt officials, not the emperor. It excluded Chao Kai from the 108 people. Sung Chiang surrendered, promoted revisionism, changed Chao Kai's Righteousness Hall to Loyalty and Righteousness Hall, and accepted amnesty. The struggle between Sung Chiang and Kao Ch'iu was a factional fight within the landlord class. Sung Chiang surrendered and became loyal to the government." Chairman Mao's instructions profoundly revealed the essence of the "Legend" in advocating the surrender-ist line, pointed out the true features of Sung Chiang in promoting revisionism and surrender-ism, and expounded Lu Hsun's theories on the "Legend," raising them to the height of resisting and preventing revisionism.

With the most thorough Marxism, Chairman Mao has decided the case of the "Legend." However, as long as the class struggle exists, as long as the surrender-ists and the surrender-ist thinking exist, and as long as revisionism exists, there is the possibility of the reversal of the case of the "Legend." In history, reversals after decisions are found in foreign countries as well as China. Lenin and Stalin decided the road of the October Revolution of the Soviet Union, yet Khrushchev, the moment he came into power, reversed the course, revised the history of the party of the Soviet Union for this reason, and created public opinion for his project to usurp the party and the government and restore capitalism. The struggle to decide and to reverse cases will thread through the entire process of the socialist historical stage. Nevertheless, as long as the revolutionary people use Marxism, Leninism, and Mao Tse-tung's thought as the weapons, intensively and persistently deploy revolutionary great criticisms, and acquire a profound understanding of the dangers and the manifestations of the surrender-ists and the surrender-ist thinking, it will be difficult for revisionism to reverse the case. Therefore, we must conscientiously study and comprehend Chairman Mao's instructions and launch criticisms and discussions of the "Legend." It will have a momentous and profound significance to our party and our people, today and in the future, in this century and in the next, in adhering to Marxism, opposing revisionism, and persevering in Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.

6080

CSO: 4005